

Chronology of Nepal History

RECONSTRUCTED



BY

"BHARATA CHARITRA BHASKARA"

PANDIT KOTA VENKATACHELAM

Chronology of Nepal History

RECONSTRUCTED

(Nepalaraja Vamsavali)

Author & Publisher :

"Bharata Charitra Bhaskara"

Pandit KOTA VENKATACHELAM.

GANDHINAGAR

VIJAYAWADA - 2.

AUTHOR OF

"The Genesis of the Human Race (Manava Srishti Vijnanam), Historicity of 'Vikramaditya & Salivahana' in English and Brahmanda Srishti Vijnana, Kalisaka Vijnana (three parts) Abhasachristavam, Dhruvanivasa-Khandanam, Andhrulevaru, Jambudweepam, Bharatiya Sakamulu, Agnivamsapurajulu, Guptarajulevaru, Asokuni kalamu, Advita Bodhini etc., in Telugu.

Kali year : 5054,

A. D. 1953.

All Rights reserved }
by the Author. }

• 1953 First Edition: 1000 Copies.

2

Price :—

India	3—4—0
British	5 Shillings
America	1 Doller.

DEDICATION

To
THE PEOPLE
of
NEPAL.

Kali 5054.

— Author.

Sahini Press,
Vijayawada - 1

Chronology of Nepal History Reconstructed

CONTENTS.

	Page
1. The Royal Dynasties of Nepal	— 1
2. The Kali Era in the Royal Dynasties	— "
3. Authenticity of the Vamsavali	— 4
4. The Antiquity of Bharat	— 8
5. Emperor Vikramaditya and his Era	— 12
6. The Sri Harsha Era	— 34
7. Conflicting and absurd argument of Dr Buhler	— 37
8. Puranic History	— 40
9. The Kali Era	— "
10. Alexander's Invasion	— 41
11. The Chronology of the Vamsavali	— 46
12. I. Gopala Dynasty	— 47
13. II. Ahir Dynasty	— "
14. III. Kirata Dynasty	— 48
15. IV. Somavamsi Dynasty	— 54
16. Age of Adi Sankaracharya	— 57
17. Pilgrimages in Kashmir	— 62
18. Sankara Vijayas	— 63
19. V. Surya Vamsi Dynasty	— 66
20. Misrepresentation of Dr. Buhler	— 68
21. VI. Thakuri Dynasty	— 70
22. Chronology of Nepal Kings Reconstructed	— 76
VII. Navakot Thakuri Dynasty	— 81
VIII. The second Thakuri Dynasty of Amsuvarman	— "
IX. The Karnata Dynasty	— 82
X. The Suryavamsi Dynasty of Bhatgam	— 83
XI. The Third Thakuri Dynasty	— 84
XI. (a) Bhatgam Line	— "
" (b) Katmandu Line	— 85
" (c) Lalitapattana Line	— 87
Appendix I.	— 89
Appendix II.	— 103
Appendix III.	— 109
Appendix IV.	— 119
Errata	— 121



MAHARAJAPOSHAKAS

1.	Sri Tangirala Veera Raghaviah pantulu garu Zamindar of Ampapuram etc. Estates, (National Indian Life Insurance Company, Ltd., Vijayavada)	116—0—0
2.	Sri Yaddanapudi Pichayya Sarma garu Vijayawada	116—0—0
3.	Sri Nanduri Veerabhadra pakayaji garu Vijayawada	116—' —0
4.	Sri Jaldu Ramarao garu, Masulipatam	116—0—0
5.	Sri Chilukuri Venkateswara Rao garu, Markondapadu	116—0—0
6.	Sri Tumuluri Sivaramayya pantulu garu B. A B L., Advocate, Nellore.	100—0—0
7.	Sri Bezwada Ramachandra Reddi garu M. P. Nellore	100—0—0
8.	Sri Inguva Sri Krishnayya garu Advocate, Nellore.	100—0—0
9.	Sri Chivukula Malkondayya Pantulugaru Advocate, Nellore.	100—0—0
10.	Sri Tangirala Subba Rao pantulu garu	100—0—0
11.	Sri Kota Venkatappayya pantulugaru Guntur	100—0—0

RAJAPOSHAKAS

12.	Sri Kondamudi Sreeramulu Pantulu garu Advocate, Tenali.	50—0—0
13.	„ Kambhampati Venkata Somayajulu garu Iragavaram	50—0—0
14.	„ Rentachintala Perayya Sastry garu Vijayawada	50—0—0
15.	„ Kunderu Satyanarayana Pantulu garu, Advocate, Vijayawada	50—0—0
16.	„ Ivaturi Sanandayy Pantulu garu, Masulipatam	50—0—0
17.	„ Kalipatnam Narasimhamurthy garu Pleader, Masulipatam	50—0—0
18.	„ Kunapuli Venkatramayya garu Masulipatam	50—0—0
19.	„ Neti Venkata Narayana Murthy garu Advocate, Masulipatam	50—0—0
20.	„ Kanuputi Sitaramayya garu, Tadepalligudem	50—0—0
21.	„ Vinjamuri Venkata Narasimhacharyulu garu, Pentapadu	50—0—0
22.	„ Kolichina Ramalingeswara Suryanarayana Sarma Garu, Parimella	50—0—0
23.	„ Mantrirao Satyanarayana Rao garu, Advocate, Tanuku.	50—0—0





"Bharata Charitra Bhaskar"
PANDIT KOTA VENKATACHELAM
Author
Born on 21-4-1885

Foreword

By

Arsha Vidyabhushana,

Sri Jatavallabha Purushottam garu, M. A.,

Lecturer in Sanskrit, S. R. R. & C. V. R. College, Vijayawada.

(Formerly Principal, Sanskrit College, Kovvur.)

The evils resulting from the attempt of the western Indologists to compress the history of India extending over about crores of years into the small compass of 4000 or 5000 years to suit the Biblical conception of the age of the world and the historical conception of the western countries are incalculable. By this mutilation of Indian chronology, the age of the Vedas is cut down by crores of years, and the Ramayana, the Mahabharata and the Puranas have become but myths or are supposed to contain a negligibly small kernel of truth and are entirely unreliable for historical studies. The conception of the four ages of Krita, Treta, Dwapara and Kali is supposed to be fantastic and all the detailed accounts of kings and dynasties given in the Puranas are entirely discounted. As a consequence, the history of India is made to start with Alexander's invasion or with Gautama Buddha

Although some Indian scholars like Abinash Chandra Das have carried back the beginning of Indian civilization by millenia of years and Geological and Astrological and archaeological evidence unrolling itself every day is categorically repudiating the chronology assigned to ancient Indian history by western Orientalists, still the history taught in our schools and colleges runs in the old and condemned rut and the historical scholars in our universities are sticking with dogged loyalty to the theories of their masters from Sir William Jones to Vincent Smith. No scholar ever thought of trying to find out what exactly was wrong with the Puranas and other indigenous historical works like Rajatarangini and Nepala Raja Vamsavali to merit condemnation and distrust. It became a superstition with historians to swallow every dogma uttered by the early western Indologists and to look down upon indigenous historical accounts. The superstition has grown so menacing that even if a man of original thinking could establish, by irrefutable

evidence, the correctness of a particular point in the Puranic or other indigenous account, these historians have lost the intellectual honesty to correct the standing theory and accept the new one. Open-mindedness, the sine-qua-non of a research scholar has become entirely absent, with the result that any attempt to refute an old theory is condemned as not falling in line with the received ideas and notions of the research scholars. Goodness alone knows how a thesis can fall in line with a theory which it professes to refute!

It is under these circumstances that the venerable author of this book who is well neigh a septuagenarian seeks to open the eyes of the historical minded people to a vista of historical facts widely spread over the vast range of the Puranic and other historical literature in Sanskrit. He has traced the history of Bharat from its earliest beginnings, and has shown in his research publications, which are about a score in number, that Aryavarta was the cradle of humanity, that humanity and human civilization spread to all countries on the globe from this land, that the dynastic lists given in the puranas are cent percent correct and that there is nothing outrageous to our historical sense in the historical portions of the Puranas and that unless and until due evidence is given to the Puranas and other historical works in Sanskrit like Rajatarangani and Nepal Raja Vamsavali no genuine history of Bharat can be constructed.

Sri Pandit Venkatachalam's works have earned the encomium of eminent intellectuals like Dr. B. Pattabhi Sita Ramayya, Kavisamrat Viswanatha Satyanarayana Garu M. A., Kalaprapurna Dr. Chilukuri Narayana Rao Pantulu M A., P. Hd; Sri Paramahansa Parivrajakacharya, Sri Jagadguru Sri Vimalananda Bharati Swamy, Siddheswari Peetadhipati (M. A.) and K. S. Ramaswami Sastriyar, Retired Dt. Judge, Madras etc. and are bound to appeal to a wider circle of scholars when translated into English. Some of the theories of the author are revolutionary in nature and would naturally startle the Indologists. I hope, the Indologists would soon recover from the shock and pause to consider the weight of arguments, the force of logic and the abundance of evidence on the side of his theories and would not hesitate to dub him a historian in the true sense of the word and a pioneer in the field of reconstructing the genuine history of Bharat.

In refuting the wrong identity of Chandragupta Maurya with Sandrocottus of the Greeks, in establishing the historicity of

Vikramaditya, in salvaging the history of Kashmir and Nepal from the tampering hands of the western Indologists and in several other things, the author has exhibited remarkable originality and a penetrating intellect.

The author has put the English-knowing public under a deep debt of gratitude by placing into their hands this thesis on the genuine history of Bharat, so ably translated by Sri M. Sivakammayya Garu M. A. The scope of the thesis is fully explained by the author in his preface. I fervently hope that, ere long, all the Telugu publications of the author will be translated into English either by himself or by other competent scholars, so that Indological studies may inaugurate a new era in consonance with the freedom achieved by Bharat from political slavery and the resultant intellectual slavery.

Vijayawada,)
4—9—1953.)

Jatavallabha Purushottam, M. A.,
Lecturer in Sanskrit
S. R. R. & C. V. R. College.



Nepala-Raja Vamsavali

Introduction.

The author of this book needs no introduction to the Telugu reading public. He is well-known in Andhra for the numerous volumes of Arya Vignanam Series which he has been bringing out regularly at a remarkably rapid rate in the face of the most adverse and discouraging circumstances.

His work in this direction which belongs to the domain of historical research, though of a very unusual type, has one for him the respectful admiration of eminent patriots and savants like Dr. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Kalaprapurna Dr. Chilukuri Narayanarao and Kavi Samrat Viswanadha Satyanarayana who have been impressed by his vast erudition no less than by his rare courage and single minded devotion to his patriotic endeavour to recover and establish the historical value of our epics and Puranas and the hoary antiquity of our perennial civilisation.

His thesis in broad outline is :

1. Our epics and Puranas afford indubitable historical material on the basis of which a continuous, consistent and authentic history of our ancient culture and civilisation can be constructed.

2. The view, propagated by interested and biassed European Orientalists that our epics and Puranas are merely imaginative literary works of exclusively religious and ethical value and unreliable for historical purposes, is entirely baseless.

3. The detailed accounts of historical events and the dynastic lists of the kings of the various kingdoms of Bharat with their reigning periods, from the time of the Mahabharata war available in our epics and Puranas, are supported by indubitable scientific and astronomical data, imbedded in the same deliberately to guard against such allegations and perversions.

4. The biassed conclusions of the European Oriental scholars are themselves based on dubious evidence, vague assumptions, arbitrary hypotheses mischievous interpretations and illogical and flimsy arguments though unfortunately they have acquired the status of proved historical facts by the mere prestige of the ruling nation to which they belonged.

long uncontradicted emphatic repetition, passage of time and the meek slavish acquiescence of the Indian Historical Scholars who were their disciples.

5. It is incumbent on us, now that we are free from the degrading incubus of political subordination, to recover our cultural freedom and integrity as well, and attempt to reconstruct the true history of our country after a careful and dispassionate enquiry into the genuine sources and all the authentic historical records and tradition available to us, so that the nation may plan for and achieve its destiny in the future on the basis of and in conformity with the bent of its native genius manifest in its past history.

His thesis is based on his contention

1. that the contemporaneity of Alexander the Great and Chandra gupta Maurya, which is the sheet-anchor of the chronology of ancient Indian History, so far as the Western European Orientalists and their unquestioning Indian disciples are concerned, is not, as it is commonly taken for granted, a proved historical fact but a mere hypothesis and a very questionable hypothesis at that and

2. The eras in vogue in our country and mentioned in our literature and Puranas which have been totally ignored and rejected by these European historians deserve recognition and full use in reconstructing the history of our country, as also the scientific and astronomical data available in our literature which have been altogether neglected, perhaps owing to ignorance of their significance and because do not support their own biased and arbitrary assumptions.

3. The current text-books of history, taught in our schools and colleges are full of inconsistent and deliberately distorted accounts of our past, the result of a steady attempt on the part of the alien scholars to reduce the antiquity of our history and civilisation and to breed in us an inferiority complex.

4. If the historical value of the Puranas and our eras is once properly recognised, there is enough historical material in our ancient literature to enable us to reconstruct our ancient history and evolve a connected, continuous and consistent chronological account of the various parts and therefore of the entire country of Bharat.

The author has been endeavouring, through his various publications of Arya Vignanam Series in Telugu, to present his views and

the results of his valuable researches to the Andhra public with copious references to his authorities and elaborate arguments in support of his conclusions and earnest appeals for consideration and honest acceptance or refutation of his thesis. But so entrenched has been the prestige of the European Orientalists and their blind followers among the English educated Indian scholars in the field of historical research and so deplorably irrevocable has been the mental slavery and lethargy to which the nation has been acclimatised, that his views have not as yet gained the respect and attention which they deserve at the hands of our students and teachers of history. Even our University professors and research scholars in history, with a few honourable exceptions, have not shown the least inclination to take the trouble of examining the original views of the author, the evidence and arguments he advances in support of the same and express their honest opinion favourable or unfavourable or attempt a refutation of his thesis, which he welcomes in the interests of the final discovery of truth, which should be the objective of every earnest historian.

It was this poor response and callous indifference to his efforts in the Andhra area that goaded this irrepressible veteran to seek for a more alert and courageous attitude and response among the historical scholars of the other parts of India and outside and hence his attempts to get at least some of his numerous historical treatises translated into English so that they may be presented to all English knowing readers interested in history. But even in this attempt he is handicapped by the reluctance of the professional and specialist historians to help him. He has not been able, in spite of his best efforts, to secure the services of a single historical scholar for the task of translating his books into English. But in his answering determination and indomitable courage he has chosen to take the risk of entrusting the task of translating into English his valuable original historical researches, to a mere layman. The present translator has been a student of mathematics and science and a teacher of English language and literature and hence, an utter layman so far as history is concerned. But even as a layman and a citizen of Free Bharat, he feels that the researches and views of the eminent author deserve wide publicity and critical examination at the hands of competent scholars and hence this venture on his part to encroach on the domain of the historians who have only themselves to blame for the anomaly. This is the explanation and apology of the translator and he will be only too glad to give place to a regular student

of history, if any be forthcoming, in any future attempt of the author to publish similar translations of his other works into English, if, as a consequence of these translations more interest and curiosity be aroused in the English knowing public of India in his attempts to reconstruct the true history of ancient India.

This volume is devoted exclusively to the history of Nepal for which the main source book, accepted on all hands, is the *Nepala Raja Vamsavali*. Here in the author exposes the arbitrary and mischievous manner in which the Western European Orientalists have dealt with the native source book, even while relying upon it mainly for all their conclusions, rejecting some of the dates, distorting some of the eras, amending the text in some places, interpolating irrelevant material so that they may reject the entire text on the ground of the inconsistency of the interpolated matter with the rest, and interpreting the text in the most illogical manner to suit their preconceived notions and theories and assumptions and to agree with the questionable evidence of coins, inscriptions and accounts of travel of foreign visitors to which they attach more importance than to native literature or tradition. The author exposes their deliberate and dishonest attempt to bring this history of Nepal into harmony with the similarly false histories of their own concoction, of the other regions of Bharat like Magadha and Kashmir, all inspired by the same unholy desire to reduce the antiquity of our history and civilisation by 1200 years, after the Mahabharata war of 3138 B. C. and 1000 years before it.

From the text of the *Nepala Rajavamsavali* as edited and interpreted by the learned author, two facts of general interest to all Indians interested in the ancient culture of Bharat, are established incidentally and established beyond doubt

1. that Sri Adi Sankaracharya who stood up against the buddhistic onslaughts on Hinduism, revived it throughout the country and established the great Advaitic religious institutions known as Sankara Peethams in the different corners of the country, belongs to 509 B.C., and

2. that Vikramaditya, the famous hero of literature and legend is a historical personage, and Indian Emperor who visited Nepal in 57 B. C., induced the then king of Nepal, Amsuvarman to accept the status of a Samanthal, within his empire and inaugurated his era there according to the *Nepala Raja Vamsavali*, as published in the *Indian Antiquary* Vol. XIII P. 411 ff.

As a result of the determination of the times of these historical personages Sri Adi Sankaracharya and Emperor Vikramaditya, many other events in the religious and cultural as well as political history of Bharat are determined fairly accurately -- such as the times of Buddha, Jina or Mahavira, Kumarila Bhatta, Ramanuja, Madhva, Nagarjuna, Patanjali and the events of the life of Adi Sankara as the author shows in Appendix III, the other appendices are also well calculated to impress on the reader the wealth of historical material available to us if only we make proper use of our indigenous sources, in epics and Puranas -- Appendix I showing the contemporaneity of the kings and royal dynasties of three major kingdoms of Bharat Magadha, Nepal and Kashmir. Appendix II showing the chronology of the imperial Royal Dynasties of Bharat from the time of the Mahabharata war down to the Modern period. Appendix IV drawing our attention to some major errors in modern books on Indian History.

After exposing the mischief of the foreigners the author sets about reconstructing the history of Nepal on the basis of the evidence in the text freed from all distortion, interpolation and misinterpretation. The exposure of the foreign historians as well his own constructive endeavour in this instance is quite typical of the author's work and gives the reader a clear idea of the point of view and method of enquiry and nature of the objective of the learned author.

It is to be hoped that this publication will result in drawing the attention of atleast some of the historical scholars all over India and abroad genuinely interested in the true history of ancient India, to his original thesis and in course of time a true and comprehensive history of the country based on all authentic evidence will be ascertained and evolved by unbiassed and dispassionate examination of all the available evidence. May the truth triumph, early as it is inevitably bound to triumph, ultimately.

The translator has tried his best to keep the language within the bounds of good manners but he pleads the difficulty of stating charges of dishonesty, mischief and falsehood in polite language. Perhaps some discourtesy is inevitable in such controversial matter and he craves to be judged with indulgence in this respect.

Andhra Jateeya Kalasala,)
Masulipatam, 20-5-1953.)

(Sd.) M. Siya Kamayya, M. A.

ॐ

Nepala Raja Vamsavali

Preface.

— (By the Author.)

The history of our country and our people is embodied in our Puranas and epics. These works contain genuine and brief historical records, from the beginning of the creation to the end of the twenty-eight Dwapara yuga. The history of the kings of the subsequent period also is given in the Puranas and it is named as the history of the future kings. The Puranas give the history of 2811 years from the Mahabharata war to the end of the Andhra dynasty. During this period reigned the Barhadradha, the Pradyota, the Sisunaga, the Nanda, the Maurya, the Sunga, the Kanva and the Andhra dynasties. In this Puranic account we have the list of kings and the period of the reign of each king. It is said that thereafter the seven Andhra-Bhrutya kings would rule. These seven kings were of the Gupta dynasty.

The history of 245 years of the Gupta emperors is given in Kaliyugaraja vrittanta, which is a part of Bhavishya Purana. 3056 years after Mahabharata War in 82 B. C., the Gupta empire ended and Vikramaditya of the Panwar dynasty conquered the whole of India and annexed the Magadha empire. The kings of the Panwar dynasty reigned from 2710 Kali to 4295 Kali, or from 392 B. C. to 1193 A. D. An account of the kings of that dynasty with their reigning periods is given in the Pratisarga parva of Bhavishya Purana.

During the reign of the last Andhra king the Magadha Empire dismembered owing partly to internal feuds. It was split up into 12 small states. Chandragupta of the Gupta dynasty who was the minister and commander in the Andhra empire murdered the last Andhra emperor Chandrasri and became the guardian of his son minor Pulomavi, whom also he murdered.

This Chandragupta belonged to the Licchavi Kshatriya community (Suryavamsi) and is the founder of the Gupta Dynasty.

After murdering Pulomavi he annexed the northern portion of the Magadha province upto the river Ganges including Pataliputra, to his kingdom consisting of Ayodhya, Tirhat etc. He shifted his capital from Girivraja to Pataliputra, where he was crowned.

At this juncture came the invasion of Alexander. Before crossing the Sindhu, Alexander with his armies camped in the Yavana province called Urasa (or Uraga) which is now in the present Afganistan. Samudragupta the son of Chandragupta and the grandson (Dowhitra) of the king of Nepal who has been on hostile terms with his father and step-brother was rallying his armies in the Yavana provinces of Abhisara, Urasa, Simhapura Divyakataka and Uttarakjyotisha, in order to proceed against his father and recover the Pataliputra kingdom. The Yavana kshatriyas gradually lost their caste and became Mlechhas as they ceased to undergo and perform the Vedic ceremonies and rituals such as Upanayana. They began to live by unworthy means such as theft and butchery.

They were excommunicated by the other kshatriyas of India. They lived as mercenary soldiers, in the various provinces of India. In the Mahabharata war they fought on the side of Duryodhana. We have got detailed description of the technique of their warfare and their status in the army in the Mahabharata. They were tenacious fighters and were stationed in weak spots in the army. Many of these Yavanas were proficient in Astrology and Astronomy. **Yavanarshi**, the famous astrological author was a brahmin belonging to the Mlechcha community in which, however, the division of the four castes continued. In Kalhana's Rajatarangini (1148 A. D.) we have the story of a Yavana Mlechcha Brahmana.

“ निक्षुको धान्यमुष्टीना योवनो ग्रामजो द्विजः ।

योप्यभूद् ग्राम दैवज्ञो वैधेयो लोष्टकामिवः ”

“ భిక్షుకో ధాన్యముష్టినా యోవనో గ్రామజో ద్విజః ।

యోప్యభూద్గ్రామ దైవజ్ఞో వైధేయో లోష్టకామివః ”

“ Bhikshuko dhanya mushtina yovano gramajodvijah
yopyabhut gramadaivajno Vydheyo lostakabhidhah ”

(Raj. 7—295).

“ There was a brahmin born in a Yavana village who begged arms of paddy. His name was Loshtaka, and he was considered to be an astrologer of that village.

The Yavana women were handsome and they were generally the bodyguards of the kings of various provinces fanning chowries to the kings.

“ प्राग्ज्योतिषा मधिपश्शूरो म्लेच्छानामधिपो बली ।

यवनै स्स हेतोरजा भगदत्तो महारथः ॥ ”

“ ప్రాగ్జ్యోతిషమధిపశ్శూరో మ్లేచ్ఛానామధిపో బలీ ।

యవనైస్సహేతోరజా భగదత్తో మహారథః ॥ ”

“ Prakjyotisha madhipassuro mlechchanamadhipo bali !

Yavanaissahito Raja Bhagadatto maharadhah ” !!

Bharatam. Sabha. ch. 51-13, 14.

“ In the pragjyotisha kingdom there lived the Kirata kshatriyas who were mlechchas. (The Kiratas were not an uncivilised tribe. They were a sect of Arya Kshatriyas. Like the Ramattas, Haras, Hunas and Yavanas they attained Mlechchahood by giving up Vedic-rituals. The Kshatriya Mlechchas are referred to in the Vedas by the word “ Dasyues ”. (Vide Manu 10-43-45)

Bhagadatta, the Great warrior was the king of Kiratas. Pragjyotisha was a kingdom on the eastern border of India near Assam. His subjects were kshatriya Mlechchas; himself was an Arya Kshatriya following the Vedic Dharma. The Mahabharata mentions many sects of Mlechchaised Kshatriyas.

“ रामठान् , हार, हूणांश्च, प्रतीच्याश्चैव ये नृपाः ।

म्लेच्छान् परमदारुणान् , पल्लवान् , वर्बराश्चैव ,

किरातान् , यवनान् , शकान् ॥”

“ రామణాక్, హర, హునాంశ్చ, ప్రతీచ్ఛాన్తైవర్యే నృపాః ।
 మ్లేచ్ఛాన్ పరమకారుణాక్, పప్లవాక్, బర్బరాన్తైవ, కిరాదాః
 యవనాక్, శకాక్ ” ॥

(Bharatam Sabha Parva 32 ch. whole)

‘ Ramattan, Hara, Hunamscha, Pratichyaschaiva ye nrupaha!
 Mlechchan paramadarunan paplavan barbaraschaiva Kiratan
 Yavanan Sakan ” ॥

(In connection with the Rajasuya sacrifice Sahadeva conquered the following cruel Mlechcha tribes :-)

“ The Ramattas, the Hunas, the Barbaras, the Kiratas, the Yavanas, the Sakas and the (Kshatriya Mlechchas) kings in the west of Bharat, They were converted to Islam in the 12 th century but yet some of the old names of these communities are still preserved along with their communal entity. The present day ‘Hur, is a corrupt form of the original word “ Hara”. People of these Indian communities like the Hunas, the Barbaras, the Pallavas, the Sakas, the Yavanas and the Ramattas or Roomakas gradually occupied Europe, Africa and Northern Asia, and widely spread. It appears that the ancient people of all countries who were the original inhabitants of North-western India, who migrated there periodically.

We already saw how Samudragupta was getting ready for an expedition against his father and step-brother. With this rallied military force he gave a terrible fight to Alexander, by which he was obliged to retreat. On the way he died at Babylon with a broken heart due to his defeat in India. Around this historical fact, modern historians have woven a web of untruths which are passing for history. While Zandrames, Sandrocottus and Sandrocyptus are the corrupt forms of Chandrasri, Chandragupta, (of Gupta dyansty) and Samudragupta respectively; the modern historians have wrongly identified them with Mahapadmananda, Chandragupta Maurya (of the Maurya Dynasty) and Bindusara or Amitraghata. This was the period between 326 B. C.,- 322 B. C.

If we reckon the respective periods of the various dynasties given in the Puranas backwards from 327 B. C. (of Chandrasri and Gupta

Chandragupta) we arrive at 3138 B. C., which is the date of the Mahabharata war. That Kali era begins with 3102 B.C., is supported by the astronomical references in the Puranas. Western scholars like Sir William Jones, Dr. Buhler, Cunningham, Dr. Wilson, Dr. Stein and Dr. Hultzsch etc., have also adopted this era. The Saptarshi era or the Loukikabda or the Kashmirabda which begins with 3076 B.C., the year of the Swargarohana of the Pandavas. When the western scholars began to write the history of India in 1859 A. D., there were three eras current in India. 1. The Yudhistira era (3138 B.C.) 2. The Kali era (3102 B.C.) 3. The Saptarshi era or The Laukikabda (3076 B.C.). The Western scholars ought to have started the history with one of these three eras but instead of that they made the date of Alexander's invasion (326 B.C.) the starting point of Indian history. All the Puranas give connected regular accounts of dynasties from the Mahabharata war (3138 B.C.). It is surprising that in this respect the modern historians went their own way without valid grounds for deviating from the Puranic accounts from which they solely derived the ~~little~~ material that is found in their works. They went to the length of proclaiming that prior to Alexander's invasion there was no important event in Sanskrit literature that could be the starting point of Indian history. These historians entirely left out the Andhra and Gupta kings of Magadha who were really the contemporaries of Alexander and made Chandragupta Maurya Alexander's contemporary who actually lived 1200 years before Alexander. The year of Chandragupta Maurya's coronation was brought down from 1534 B. C., to 322 B.C. No wonder that a history with such bad beginning has proved a mess of mistakes, doubts and misleading accounts.

I myself was a victim of the misleading writings of the western scholars and made certain statements based on them in my earlier works. Later as and when I detected their actual errors and mistakes, I made amends in my writings to my earlier statements,

In this present work is given an account of the history of Nepal from 4159 B. C.

Here we have details of the dynasties, the kings and their periods given in the Kali era. The western historians could not naturally reconcile their notion of the contemporaneity of Alexander and Chandragupta Maurya, with the Kali era frequently used in the

Nepal Rajavamsavali and so they discarded the Kali era as baseless and to support their wrong theory they took to foul means like misrepresentation and concoction, which are exposed completely in the course of this book.

It will be evident from the Nepala Rajavamsavali that the great Adi Sankaracharya was born in 509 B. C., that Emperor Vikramaditya of the Panwar dynasty lived in the 1st century B.C., and that he went to Nepal and brought Amsuvarma the king of Nepal under his empire and there inaugurated the Vikrama era of 57 B. C. or 3044 Kali, (Vide "The Indian Antiquary Vol. XIII pp. 411 ff")

Dr. Buhler made the unfair attempt of cutting down the names of certain kings and their reigning periods and of showing that Vikramaditya and Amsuvarma were not contemporaries by bringing Amsuvarma to the seventh century A.D. However, he failed miserably in this attempt. This will be exposed in detail in this book.

Alberuni (1031 A. D.) in his history of India, mentions the Sri Harsha era of 457 B. C., as being current in Nepal. Dr. Buhler made the daring attempt of substituting Sri Harsha Siladitya of 606 A. D., for Sri Harsha of 457 B. C., and of thus bringing into existence the Harsha Siladitya era which is entirely a fiction.

By this he tried to bypass the Vikrama era (57 B. C.) and the Sri Harsha era (457 B. C.) and to tamper the history of Nepal as he liked, This bungling cut at the very root of his theories and exposed his evil intents in their nakedness. His inconsistent and self-contradictory theories are shown in this book. Similar attempts were made by other European Indologists to cut down the antiquity of Indian history, This injustice done to Bharat is exposed by us in the present work and in our "Chronology of Kashmir History Reconstructed" and also in our "Chronology of Iudin History Reconstructed". We hope that these and the other works of ours will be closely studied by the students of Indian history along with the works of the Western Indologists on the subject and that ere long the misleading nature of those writers will be fully realised and fresh attempts will be made by research scholars to re-write true Indian History.

Although we have so far produced 13 books in Tulugu and 2 books in English presenting of new outlook on the ancient history



of India, Research scholars of Indian history have not taken sufficient interest either in supporting or contradicting of my works. Most of the individual scholars whom we met personally and who lent us their ear for some time, admitted that there was much force in our arguments but it might not be possible for them to readily accept new theories after having accepted for decades as settled facts the theories of Western Indologists. Some of them had such a prejudiced mind that they refuse to hear us. We are in sympathy with them. They may take their own time to come round. But there are other scholars among us who may be laymen to history and yet count much in our intellectual life and are capable of evaluating works of this kind. We had therefore recourse to such scholars, to some of whom we are much indebted.

We have to make special mention of Sri Modali Sivakamayya garu M. A. Vice Principal of the Andhra Jateeya Kalasala, Musulipatam who kindly translated the Telugu original of this book into English and has contributed an introduction to this book. He is a great scholar widely respected for his intellectual honesty and we are proud that our work has been translated by him.

It should not be understood that Sri Sivakamayya garu is merely our translator. He dived deep into the subject and made special study of the concerned period of history both from Indegenous sources and the mordern foreign sources and put to us searching questions, which gave us an oppurtunity to clarify certain points, as an illustration of which we may mention the following fact :-

The western historians assigned Asoka to the 3rd century B. C., on the strength of the supposed references, in Asoka's inscriptions to the Greek kings of that period, so the worthy translator told us that unless we contradicted this with sufficient tangible evidence, our assertion that Asoka belonged to the 15th century B. C., would be simply dogmatic. Thereupon the author examined critically the Asokan inscriptions and produced a brochure on the time of Asoka and the contemporary Yona kings, (15th century B. C.) which has immensely satisfied Sri Siva Kamayya garu. It is in this way that he carried through, our request for rendering this book into English.

We are thankful to Arsha Vidyabhushana Sri Jatavallabha Purushottam garu M. A. Lecturer in Sanskrit S. R. R. & C. V. R.

College Vijayawada (Formerly principal, Sanskrit college, Kovvur.) for taking interest in my works and encouraging me. We cannot forget his occasional help in the translation of our works.

We deplore the entire lack of the capacity to receive new things among our modern research scholars. They have a closed mind and they refuse to pursue a line of thought unfamiliar to them. We have sent our books by registered post to scores of them in Andhra Desa, most of them had not got the courtesy to acknowledge the receipt and none of them was kind enough even to criticise or appreciate them at least in a private letter. But it is to the credit of the other scholars to whom we have already referred that they are carefully studying my works and are keen on seeing that historical works of this type should give their due place in our historical studies. However, the late Kalaprapurna, Mahopadhyaya Dr. Chilukuri Narayana Rao pantulu M. A. P. Hd. L. T., Retired Superintendent of Oriental languages, Government Arts College Anantapur, and one of the remarkable history scholar in our country, is a noble exception and he showed his appreciation of our efforts by contributing an introduction to one of our books. He clearly admitted that modern historical research was vitiated by a contempt for the Puranic account of our history and that it was the main cause of its wrong lead to our historical studies. The English translation of his sentences are given below:—

"Till now our Indian History has been written in imitation of that of the Western Writers. Those books are prescribed as Texts in schools and Colleges for students. The teachers instruct and the pupils study those books, in a blind manner, without any critical outlook. So we are not able to get a correct and true account of our National history. Even those who obtained English degrees wrote history without further research, depending entirely on the writings of Western scholars. There is no agreement in the writings of the learned historians even though they wrote them after some investigation. As the Occidentalists had no faith, in the original sources and records, excepting the inscriptions and in the Puranas, our historians also disregarded and neglected them (Puranas). However there is no dearth of wise and judicious chroniclers among us, outside the range of the Western - educated, who can use their intellect to make a thorough study of the above sources, and produce an accurate and correct history. Of these, Sri Kota Venkatachalam, an Andhra scholar of

Vijayawada tops the list. I have the goodluck of having acquaintance and association with the gentleman for the past three years. His attempts to exhibit the Bharatiya Culture, civilisation and traditions and the truths as expounded in his books are, indeed, peerless and praise-worthy. I had the good fortune of perusing his instructive and illuminating works, the outcome of his extensive and exhaustive researches, namely, "Kali Saka Vijnanam" (three parts) "Who are Andhras?" "Criticism on the Arctic Home of the Aryans", "Manava-srishti Vijnanam or Genesis of the Human Race" and other works. Further Sri Kota Venkatachalam exposed the several blunders committed by Pargitar in his book "The Dynasties of the Kali Age" and corrected his wrong theories by citing quotations from the same Puranas, accepted as authentic by the same western scholars. I am of opinion that all the Andhras should study "Kali Saka Vijnanam". His decisions about the Jambu Dwipa Vibhagams (Divisions) are admirable. The angle of vision and the line of argument in his work "Who are Andhras?" are quite logical and original. The true origin of the Andhras has been correctly shown in this book. His criticism on the "Arctic Home" is quite an authoritative document upon Sri B. G. Tilak's work. While the Western scholars who could not fathom the depths of the Vedic lore, were led astray by the scholarship of Tilak and so praise his book, Sri Venkatachalam, with his deep knowledge of Vedic lore, was able enough to contradict and criticise it and supply correct interpretation. His work, the Bharatiya Sakas, is of great use, since it lays bare gross mistakes of the westerners and at the same time establishes the correct dates of the Indian Eras.

The eminent erudition and the critical acumen of the author arrests the spread of the false notions and upholds the cause of true and correct Indian History. He wrote several works in this vein and I trust that they will all soon see the light of the day."

Anantapur,)
14-10-1953)

Ch. Narayana Rao, M. A., Ph. D., L. T.,
(Mahopadhyaya & Kalaprapurna)

We are thankful to the press both English and Telugu, for having reviewed our works in detail.

We submitted our thesis proving the wrong identity of Sandrocottus mentioned by the Greeks with Chandragupta Maurya and establishing the identity of Sandrocottus with Gupta Chandragupta to the "All India Oriental Conference held in 1951 at Lucknow. In the "Indian history Congress" of 1951, 1952, also held in Jaipur, and Gwalior respectively we submitted our treatises. But yet our historical scholars did not care to give them due attention. Such is the apathy of historical scholars, which is the most distressing factor in my attempts to create a fresh outlook on our past among our people.

We now place before the English reading public the following five books :—

1. Indian Eras.
2. Chronology of Nepal History Reconstructed.
3. The Pre-Determined Plot in Indian History exposed.
4. Chronology of Kashmir History Reconstructed.
5. Chronology of Indian History Reconstructed.

We appeal them to study these works which reflect the genuine history of Bharat and expose the western Indologists.

NOTE

FOREWORD

Page	Line	Read	For
८	२०	credence	evidence

INTRODUCTION

००	२	won	one
००	२२	indubitable	indudifitable
०२	२८	unswerving	answering

ओम

“आर्यावर्तः पुण्यभूमिः”

Chronology of Nepal History Reconstructed

Nēpāla Rāja Vamśāvali

o r

The Royal Dynasties of Nepāl

Dr. G. Buhler C. I. E. has published in the Vol. XIII of The Indian Antiquary p. 411 ff. the essay of Dr. Bhagavanlal Indraji Ph. D. (Hons.) M. R. A. S., entitled ‘Some considerations of the History of Nēpāl’ together with his own commentary and the dynastic lists of the Kings of Nēpāl. Therein he writes :

“The History of Nēpāl, such as it was known, before the publication of my ‘Inscriptions from Nēpāl (The Indian Antiquary Vol. IX p. 168 ff.)’ was derived solely from the modern Vamśāvalies or lists of the Dynasties of which several exist in the libraries of the country.

“Dr. Wright’s ‘History of Nēpāl’ is derived from a Pārvaṭīya Vamśāvali” (The Indian Antiquary Vol. XIII p.411).

The Kali Era in the Royal Dynasties of Nepāl

In the lists of the Kings of the Royal dynasties of Nēpāl, the references to some of the prominent events are made in terms of the Kali Era. The years of the Kali Era, reckoned on the assumption of the equivalence of Kali 1 to B.C.

3101, mentioned therein have been converted into the corresponding years of the Christian Era and noted there by Dr. Buhler, who did not raise any objection to the assumption of the equivalence of the year 1 of the Kali Era to B. C. 3101. The starting point of Kali Era is B. C. 3102

In the usual strain of Western Orientalists who have consistently endeavoured to reduce the antiquity of the history of Nēpāl as of other countries of the east and, for that purpose, to depict the Royal Dynastic lists of the countries as of questionable authenticity and doubtful authority for purposes of historical reconstruction, he has rejected the times of the events noted in the Nēpāla Rājā Vamśāvali reckoned therein on the Kali Era as erroneous; he has conducted unwarranted and dubious enquiries into the dates mentioned without any specific Era and came to his own conclusions with a view to reconcile them with the other so-called accepted historical facts, themselves based similarly on questionable hypothesis and unconvincing reasoning. Thus he has attempted to push forward the recorded history of Nēpāl from B. C. 4159 to somewhere from the 6th and 7th centuries before the Christian Era, reducing the number of the Kings of some of the dynasties, reducing the length of the reigns of some others, and thus overhauling the entire history. This is his 'commentary' on the text. Besides, on the alleged ground that the letters of an inscription of King Amsuvarman of Kali 3000 or B. C. 101, resemble the script in use in the country in the 6th and 7th centuries after Christ, he has suggested, for the Kings mentioned in the inscription, times subsequent to the 6th or 7th century A. D.

With the object of rendering the text unacceptable, some inconsistent and irrelevant matter has been interpolated and on account of the obvious inconsistency of such matter, the entire text of the Royal dynasties of Nēpāl has been rejected as unreliable and unauthoritative.

All the same, in view of the absence of any other guidance or alternative authoritative source for the reconstruction of the history of Nēpāl, the names of as many of the Kings of these dynastic lists as suited their purposes have been accepted by

these Western Orientalists; the dates reckoned on the Kali Era have been rejected as unreliable and substituted by their own hypothetical dates based on guess - work and biassed assumptions. Thus the same fate befell the history of Nēpāl as to the history of India and the history of Kāshmir, in the hands of these Western Orientalists like Dr. Fleet, Cunningham, Buhler, Stein etc.

Hence, we propose to establish the validity of the Kali Era and the events recorded in the Kali Era in the lists of the Kings of Nēpāl and on their basis the antiquity of the recorded history of Nēpāl, rejecting the inconsistent, irrelevant, incorrect, conclusions of the Western scholars and the interpolated matter introduced by interested foreign critics into the text of the Royal Dynastic lists of Nēpāl. Dr. Buhler himself writes about the initial dates of the Saptarṣhi and Kaliyuga Eras thus:

“The discovery of the initial date of the Saptarṣhi Era which I obtained in Kāshmir, makes it possible to fix the reigns of the Kings after Avantivarman with perfect accuracy. The beginning of the Saptarṣhi Era is placed by the Kāshmirians on Chaitra Sudi 1 of the 25th year of the Kaliyuga, and the 24th year, (or 1148 A. D.) in which Kalhana wrote, is consequently the Saptarṣhi year 4224. For from Kaliyuga 25 to the beginning of the Śaka Era is — 3154. From Śakasamvat 1 to Kalhanā's time (1148 A. D.) is 1070. $(1070 + 3154 =) 4224$. Saptarṣhi year.

“My authorities for placing the beginning of the Saptarṣhi Era in Kali 24 are the following: First, P. Dayārām Jotṣhi gave me the subjoined verse, the origin of which he did not know:

“When the years of the Kaliyuga marked by the arrows and the eyes (i. e., five and two, or as Indian dates have to be read backward, 25) had elapsed, the most excellent seven Rishis ascended to heaven. For in the calender (used) in the world the virtuous declare the computation of the Saptarṣhi years to begin from that point.

“Pandit Dayārām explained the verse as I have done in the above translation and added that each Saptarṣhi year

began on Chaitra Sudi 1 and that its length was regulated by the customary mixing of the Chandra and Soura mānās.

"The correctness of his statement is confirmed by a passage in P. Sāhibrām's Rājatarangīni Samgraha where the author says that the Śaka (Śālivāhana) year 1786 (A. D. 1864), in which he writes, corresponds to Kali 4965 and to Saptarṣhi or Laukika Samvat 4940. One of the copyists, too, who copied the Dhvanyālōka for me in September, 1875 (A. D.) gives in the colophon, as the date of his copy, the Saptarṣhi year 4951. These facts are sufficient to prove that P. Dayārām's statement regarding the beginning of the Saptarṣhi Era is not an invention of his own but based on the general tradition of the country.

"I do not doubt for a moment that the calculation which throws the beginning of the Saptarṣhi Era back to 3076 B. C. is worth no more than that which fixes the beginning of the Kaliyuga in 3101 B. C. But it seems to me certain that it is much older than Kalhana's time, because his equation $24 = 1070$ agrees with it. It may therefore be safely used for reducing with exactness, the Saptarṣhi years, months and days mentioned in his work to years of the Christian Era. The results which will be thus obtained will always closely agree with those gained by General Cunningham, who did use the right key"

(Pages 264 to 268 Ind. Ant. Vol. VI.)

In the above quotation Dr. Buhler proves indubitably the initial dates of the Saptarṣhi Era and the Kali Era to be 3076 and 3102 B. C. respectively.

All the Purāṇās declare that the Kali Era began 36 years after the Mahābhārata war. So, we may fix the date of the Mahābhārata war as $3102 + 36 = 3138$ B. C.

Authenticity of the Vamsavali

Of the authenticity of the Vamśavali Dr. G. Buhler writes:—"It is evident that, though this Vamśavali contains many elements of historical truth, it possesses no value whatever as a whole." (The Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIII, P. 417)

It is possible to consider the true facts of the history of Nēpāl claimed to have been discovered by Bhagavān Lāl Indrājī

and commented upon by Dr. Buhler, to accept such as are really true among them, to reject such as are unacceptable and unreliable for purposes of history and to render the Vamśāvali as a whole a sufficiently useful document for the purpose of reconstructing the history of Nēpāl. Instead of that, Buhler adopts the contrary procedure, rejects the valuable historical parts of the text, selects for his criticism the obviously inconsistent interpolations, and discards all the facts of the Vamśāvali which establish the antiquity of the history and civilisation of Nēpāl.

The first of the Royal dynasties mentioned in the Vamśāvali is the Mata thirtha Gōpāla dynasty of eight kings who ruled for 522 years. The periods (given) for the reigns of the kings separately total up exactly to the period of 522 years allotted for the dynasty as a whole. But the suspicion of the authenticity of this part of the text is roused in Buhler by the figures of 88 years and 80 years and 93 years allotted to the first, third and fourth kings respectively of the dynasty.

Of the Kirāta dynasty whose kings ruled in Nēpāl for about 1118 years, Dr. Buhler says similarly, "The number of 1118 years allotted to the 29 kings of this race is, however, too great for in India the duration of a generation amounts, as the statistical tables of the life-Insurance companies show, at the outside, only to 26 years.

"They could not possibly have ruled longer than 600 or 700 years"

(The Indian Antiquary Vol. XIII p 417.)

The period of 1118 years for the reigns of 29 kings is, it seems, highly improbable, too long to be true, according to Dr. Buhler. So he presumes to conjecture that the dynasty could not have ruled for a period longer than 600 or 700 years on the whole. The basis of the argument behind his conjecture is the average life of 26 years arrived at by life Insurance companies for Indians of the 20th century A. D., itself based on statistical tables of contemporary mortality. On the basis of these figures, he presumes to fix the limits of

the lives and reigns of the kings who ruled in Nēpāl six thousand years ago. He expects all of us, Indians and Nēpālēse, the people of the countries concerned, to accept his conjectural figures based on such authority and such reasoning as authoritative facts of history. All the Indian historians who were his disciples and followed his school of thought, have till now, accepted his conclusions unquestioningly, taking his basic conjectural assumptions for proved historical facts. But this is too fantastic. The arguments of these Western Orientalists and their eastern disciples are devoid of reason or at best based on flimsy reasoning.

Their conclusions do not deserve to form the basis of the history of these countries. Conjectures and hypothesis can never form the foundation on which the superstructure of the history of any country can be built up. The History of a country should be reconstructed in accordance with the real sources and ancient authorities available and only to the extent to which such sources and authorities warrant. The attempt to fill up the gaps in the history of a country should be made only by the people of the country acquainted with the native traditions of the country, handed down from generations, and in conformity with such traditions. Such attempts should not and cannot successfully be made by foreigners or even by the natives of the country who blindly follow the foreigners, in ignorance of their own culture and customs and traditions.

Evidence with regard to the longevity of Indians of two thousand years back, available in the records of the Greek historians who actually accompanied Alexander when he invaded India or obtained their information directly from such witnesses who were in a position to observe the facts for themselves, is re-produced here.

"The Indians are not afflicted with headache, or toothache or ophthalmia, nor have they mouthsores or ulcers in any part of the body. The age to which they live is 120, 130, and 150 years, though the very old live to 200 years." (Arrian Ind. 15, 12, and Frag XXII.C.) (Vide Ancient India as described by Ktesias translated by J. W. Mac. Crindle page 18).

"They (the Indians) are just, and of all men are longest lived, attaining the age of 170 and some even 200 years." (Page 25 of Mac Crindle's Ancient India.)

"According to Ktesias, the Indian people live for 200 years." (Mac. Crindle's History of India p. 61)

"The inhabitants were believed to attain the age of a hundred and thirty years." (Early History of India By V. A. Smith, p. 100)

If our ancestors of 2000 years back were able to live from 130 years up to even 200 years, we have only to imagine how far stronger and longer-lived might have been our remoter ancestors of 6000 or 5000 years back. It is fantastic to argue that it is improbable for 29 kings to have ruled altogether for 1118 years. The figures work out to an average of only $38\frac{1}{2}$ years for each reign. This is in fact too short a period. The 22 Kings of the Bārhadradha dynasty who reigned in Magadha after the Mahābhārata War (B. C. 3138) ruled for 1000 years. On the average, each king of the dynasty must have ruled for $45\frac{1}{2}$ years. The ten kings of the Śiśunāga dynasty ruled for 360 years on the whole. On the average each king of this dynasty ruled for 36 years. The seven kings of the Gupta dynasty of Magadha including Chandraguptha and Samudragupta, ruled for 245 years, i. e. on the average 35 years each.

"We have got the recent case of Nizam-ul-Mulk, who died when he was 104; so this is not impossible"

(Vide - The Rāshatrakūtās and their times from 750 - 1000 A. D., By Ananda Sadāsiva Altēkār, p 7. Ed 1934.)

"If Fleet's reading in the Mātoī plates were correct it was possible to argue that Nandaraja was a brother of Nannarāja and therefore, may have been younger and on the throne even 78 years later than the elder brother"

(Vide Altēkār's Rāshtrakūtās and their times. Page 7)

The 96 years old "Rama Raja" of Vijayanagr went to the battle of Talikota where he died fighting with the Mohammadans.

Queen Elizabeth and Queen Victoria ruled England for over 63 - 64 years respectively. "Gangasimha" the last king of the Pānwār Dynasty went to the Kurukṣhetra war to assist Prithvi Raja against Gori Mohammad, when he was aged 90 years.

It is astounding that Dr. Buhler should attempt to determine the limits of the probable length of the reigns of kings who ruled and passed away 6000 years back, leading disciplined lives, regulating their food and pastimes with restraint and foresight, on the basis of the mortality tables of people of the Twentieth century after Christ who do not observe any restraint in food or drink or recreation but with their materialistic and hedonistic outlook indulge in excess of food and drink. The fantastic guesswork and arbitrary determinations of such western scholars constitute the unquestionable and unquestioned authorities for even their Indian disciples in their attempts to reconstruct the history of their country's past. This is extremely deplorable.

The Antiquity of Bharat

"The ancient writers of Bhārat described the founders of the dynasties of kings in the different parts of the country as the contemporaries of the Kauravās and Pāndavās (of the Mahābhārata War) out of a desire to establish their antiquity and hence their dignity. It was for the same reason the historians of the provinces of Kāshmir and Nēpāl described their kings too as the contemporaries of the Kauravās and Pāndavās." This is the surmise with which the Western Orientalists like Buhler and their followers dismiss the evidence of such historical authorities as the Vamśāvali.

The Pāndavās conquered the whole of Bhārat, performed the Rājāsūya Sacrifice and thus established their suzerainty over the whole country. The rulers of the different

kingdoms within the country were their tributories. Defeating them in the game at dice and sending them away to the forests, their cousin Duryōdhana was able to establish himself as the emperor. The ruler of Kambhoja did not submit to Duryōdhana and so Karna marched on him with his armies and put him down so that he too submitted to Duryōdhana. This is the account in the Mahābhārata. The Capital of Kambhoja was 'Rajapura' and Kambhoja now forms the Southern province of Modern Kāshmir.

In the 4th, 5th verses of Drōṇaparva in Bhāratam Bhiṣhma on his bed of arrows addressess Karna in these words:

"Karna! trusted friend of Duryōdhana, you marched on Rajapuri and defeated the Kambhojas." So this conquest must have been an event prior to the Mahābhārata War. So the history of our country is available to us from the time of the end of Dwāpara, or the beginning of the Kali Era for a period of over 5000 years till now. Of prior times too some historical information is preserved for us in our Purānās. We may have an idea of the antiquity of our country from the writings of Megasthenes.

"Megasthenes was given, at the court of Pātāliputhra, a list of the kings who had preceeded Chandragupta on the throne, 153 in number, covering by their reigns, a period of over 6000 years (Megasthenes. Fragment 23-Vide Rapson's Cambridge History of India page 409). That is to say till now for a period of nearly $6000 + 300 + 1951 = 8251$ years, the history of our country is available to us. We have also to remember that as a matter of fact the court of Pātāliputhra means the capital of the Guptha Emire. The emperor who was reigning at Pātāliputra at the time of Megasthene's embassy was Samudragupta or Chandragupta II of the Guptha dynasty of Magadha and not Chandraguptha Maurya, as wrongly identified by the Western Scholars, who thus tried to reduce the antiquity of Indian history and civilisation.

So, apart from the information contained in the Purānās, even from the evidence of Magasthenes, $8251 - 5051 = 3200$. For

the period of 3200 years at the end of the Dwāpara Yuga Indian History can be reconstructed. From that time i. e. 3200 before Kali the kingdoms of Nēpāl, Kāshmir, Magadha, Hastināpura, and Ayodhya, were in existence as such and their kings can be ascertained from time to time. Their names are recorded in the Purāṇās. The rulers of all these kingdoms, with their armies, are said to have taken part in the great Mahābhārata war according to the unequivocal descriptions in the Mahābhārata. Subsequent to the Mahābhārata war the descendents of these rulers continued to rule over their respective kingdoms. Because of the references to their ancestors of the Mahābhārata war and prior times, Dr. Buhler has rejected the texts as unreliable for historical purposes, accepted only a few of the kings mentioned therein, according to his whims and fancies, as many as suited to his own Purposes and preconceived notions and prejudices and locating the beginning of the dynastic history of the rulers of the country (Nēpāl) in the 6th or 7th century B. C., brought down the earlier kings of Nēpāl also within this range, reducing the lengths of the reigns of the kings specifically mentioned in the Vamśāvali as improbable and exaggerated, and proposes to construct an altogether new and independent history of Nēpāl. This is the commentary of Dr. Buhler on the history of Nēpāl. Accordingly he has interpreted arbitrarily and wrongly the evidence of available inscriptions deliberately distorting and reading the dates mentioned in one Era as dates reckoned on the other. Such treatment of historical material for the purpose of constructing an arbitrary and false history of a country deliberately reducing its antiquity, is without a parallel anywhere else. The mis-statements of facts and misinterpretations of evidence will all be expressed in the course of this book.

Dr. Buhler writes :—

“According to the inscriptions the twenty first king of the Śūrya Vamśi dynasty, Mānadēva reigned from between the years 386—413 of an unnamed era and the characters show that this period falls in the 4th or 5th century of our era (Christian era) yet the Vamśāvali asserts that Mānadēva's grandson Vasantadēva Varman was crowned in Kali 2800 or

301 B. C. The case of the next of the Thākūti dynasty is, if possible, worse. Its founder Amśuvarman is placed in Kali 3000 or 101 B. C., though Vikramāditya of Ujjain, whose coronation the Hindus usually locate in 57 B. C., is stated to have been to Nēpāl during the reign of his predecessor. Also there is the statement of Heun - tsang that a learned king called Amśuvarman ruled either shortly before or, during his visit to Northern India in 637 A. D. Further, the inscriptions of Amśuvarman, as well as that of Vibhuvarman which the Vamśāvali particularly mentions, show letters, (characters) which can only belong to the 6th or 7th centuries of our era.

"If more instances of the confusion prevailing in the account given by the Vamśāvali regarding this dynasty, are wanted, it will suffice to point out that Amśuvarman's seventh successor, Vasudēva, is said to have ruled in Kali 3623 or 522 A. D. Thus we get seven generations for 600 years." (Ind. Ant. Vol. XIII, Page 418.)

Starting with the figures 386-413 which are not accompanied by any indication of the Era to which they belong, and inferring the times of the information and events contained in the inscriptions from the characters or nature of the script and making it the basis of the reconstruction of the history of a country is highly objectionable and entirely unacceptable to historians. It is not possible to assert with definiteness that the letters of the inscriptions belong only to the 4th or 5th century of the Christian Era. Other scholars have expressed the opinion that they belong to the 5th or 6th century before Christ. Such doubtful evidence cannot form the basis of any historical determination.

The 21st king after Bhūmivarman in the Sūrya Vamśi is Mānadēva and his grandson Vasanthadēva Varman (the 23rd king) was, it is stated, crowned in Kali 2800 (301 B. C.). To question the authenticity of the statement in the account of the next dynasty, the Thākūr dynasty that the first king of the dynasty Amśuvarman was crowned in Kali 3000 (101 B. C.) and in his reign Vikramāditya proceeded to Nēpāl and established his Era there, this inconsistent and irrelevant reference to the

coronation of Vasanthadēva Varma in Kali 2900 or 301 B. C. has been probably interpolated by some mischief makers to render the Vamśāvali unreliable on the whole for historical purposes. This king is in no way important. He is not the founder of a dynasty. There is no indication that any event of importance occurred in his reign. It seems to be the practice in the Vamśāvali to record in the Kali Era, the date of a dynasty or an important event occurred in his reign such as the transfer of the capital. But no-where do we find the dates of the reign of an ordinary king given, without any such special justification. It is therefore probable that this reference to the coronation of Vasanthadēva Varma is itself an interpolation of a later time and not a part of the original text of the author of the Vamśāvali. This date has therefore to be rejected and ignored. There is no inconvenience or loss to the continuity of the narrative by such deletion.

Emperor Vikramaditya of Ujjain and his Era

In his reference to Amśuvarman of the Thākūr dynasty Dr. Buhler has confused us and endeavoured to shift his reign from Kali 3000 or 101 B. C., down to 7th century A. D., and to by-pass the issue of Vikramāditya and his era. There can be no doubt that Amśuvarman was crowned in Kali 3000 or 101. B. C. The Vamśāvali clearly states that emperor Vikramāditya (who was crowned in Kali 3020 or 82 B. C., and not 57 B. C., as Dr. Buhler asserts) had been to Nēpāl and established his era there during his time (Amśuvarman's time 57 B. C.) It is indisputable that Vikramāditya was born in Kali 3001 (100 B. C.) and was crowned in Kali 3020 (82 B. C) and inaugurated his era in 57 B. C. in Nēpāl.

In this connection the Bhavishya Purāna says :

“पूणेर्विशच्छते वर्षेकलौप्राप्ते भयंकरे” ॥ (भविष्य 3-1-7-14)

“शकानां च विनाशार्थं मार्यधर्मं विवृद्धये ।

जातश्शिवाज्ञया सोऽपि कैलासाद्गुह्यकालयात् ॥” (3-1-7-15)

“विक्रमादित्य नामानं पिता कृत्वा मुमुद ह ।

सबालोऽपि महाप्राज्ञः पितृमातृ प्रियंकरः ॥” (3-1-7-16)

“పంచవర్షేవయఃప్రాప్తే తపసోఽర్థవనంగతః ।

ద్వాదశాద్ర్షం ప్రయత్నేన విక్రమేణ కృతేతపః ॥ (3-1-7-17)

“పంచశాదంబావర్తీ దివ్యా పురీ యాతః శ్రియాన్వితః ।

దివ్యం సింహాసనం రమ్యం ద్వాత్రిశన్మూర్తీసంయుతం ॥ (3-1-7-18)

“పూర్ణేఽతిశచ్చతే వర్షకలాప్రాప్తేభయంకరే ॥” (భవిష్య 3-1-7-14)

“శకానాంచ వినాశార్థ మార్య ధర్మవివృద్ధయే ।

జాతశ్శివాజ్ఞయాసోఽపి కైలాసాద్ధుహ్యకాలయాత్ ॥” (3-1-7-15)

“విక్రమాదిత్య నామానంపితాకృత్వాముమోదహ ।

సబాలోఽపి మహాప్రాజ్ఞః పితృమాతృప్రియంకరః ॥” (3-1-7-16)

“పంచవర్షేవయఃప్రాప్తే తపసోఽర్థవనంగతః ।

ద్వాదశాబ్దం ప్రయత్నేన విక్రమేణ కృతంతపః ॥ (3-1-7-17)

“పశ్చాదంబావర్తీం దివ్యాం పురీం యాతః శ్రియాన్వితః ।

దివ్యం సింహాసనం రమ్యం ద్వాత్రిశన్మూర్తి సంయుతం ॥ (3-1-7-18)

“Pūrṇē thrimśachchatē Varṣhē Kalau prāptē bhayam-
karē”.

“Sakānāncha vināśārdhamārya dharmā vivruddhayē
jātaśśivājnayā sō 2. pi Kailāsāt guhyakālayāt”

“Vikramāditya nāmānam pitā kritvā mumodaha
sabālō 2. pi mahāprājñah pitrumāthru priyamkrah”

“Pancha Varṣhē Vayah prāptē tapaśś 2. dhe Vanam
gatah

dwādaśābdam prayatñnēna Vikramēna kritham tapah”

“Paśchādām- bāvathim divyām purim yātaḥ śriyānvitah
divyam simhāsanam ramyam dwathriṣanmūrthi samyutam.”

(3—1—7 - 14 to 18)

The Gist of the verses :—

About 3000 years after the advent of the detestable Kaliyuga (101 B. C.) by the command of Siva, a divine person-
age from the abode of the Guhyakās (an order of supernatural
beings) on the Kailāsa took birth in human form as the son of
king Gandharvasēna on the earth to destroy the Sakās, foreig-
ners (or excommunicated Aryan Kshatriyas) and to resuscitate

the Arya Dharma. The king rejoiced at it and named him "Vikramāditya." He was very wise even in his boyhood. He was dear to his parents. Even at the age of five he went to the forest for meditation and observed severe austerities for 12 years. Then he returned with all the powers earned by his austerities to the city of Ambāvati or Ujjain and was crowned on the celebrated Golden Throne decorated with the thirty-two golden images in the year 3020 of the Kali Era. (Birth 3001 Kali, 3006 Kali-to the forest for austerities, 3019 Kali-return from the forest, then after learning the wisdom of the stories (famous) from one Bēthāla, the coronation in 3020 Kali—inauguration of the Vikrama Era in Nēpāl 3044 Kali, the length of his reign extended over 100 years and he passed away in Kali 3120).

Kālidāsa the author of *iyotirvidābharaṇa* declares in the prefatory verses from it quoted below that he had already composed the — three poems beginning with *Raghuvamśa* and that he enjoyed the patronage and friendship of emperor *Vikramārka* who had conquered Ujjain (the lost capital of his father's time) from the śaka ruler of (Ramattha or) Roomaka (a province in the North-west of Ancient Bhārat inhabited by excommunicated Aryan-Kshatriyas) and patronised the great scholars *Sanku* etc., celebrated as the nine gems (among scholars), and several other great poets and scholars learned in astronomy and astrology like the renowned *Varāhamihira* and that he was one of the nine gems (among the poets) that adorned his court.

श्लो ॥ यो ह्रमकेशाधिपतिं शकेस्वरं जित्वा ग्रहितोज्जयनीं महाहवे ॥
 आनीय संभ्राम्य मुमोचतं त्वहो श्रीविक्रमार्क सम सद्य विक्रम ॥”
 “शंक्वादि पंडितवराः कवयस्त्वनेके ।
 ज्योतिर्विदस्य भवन्श्च वराहपूर्वाः ।
 श्री विक्रमार्कनृपसंसदि मान्यबुद्धिः ।
 तै रग्यहं नृपसखा किल कालिदास ॥”

“కావ్యత్రయం సుమతి కృద్రఘువంశపూర్వమ్ ।

పూర్వమ్ తత స్మృతిర్హితం శ్రుతికర్మవాదమ్ ।

జ్యోతిర్విదాభరణ కాలవిధానశాస్త్రమ్ ।

శ్రీ కాలిదాస కవితో హితతో బభూవ ॥”

శ్లో॥ “యో రూమకేశాధిపతిం శక్తేశ్వరం జిత్వా గ్రహితోజ్జయినీం మహాహవే
అనీయ సంభ్రామ్య ముమోచతం త్వహా శ్రీ విక్రమార్క సమ సహ్య విక్రమః॥”

“శంక్యాది పండితవరాః కవయస్త్యనేకే ।

జ్యోతిర్విదస్య మభవంశ్చ వరాహపూర్వాః ।

శ్రీ విక్రమార్క స్తప సంపది మాన్యబుద్ధి ।

స్తైరప్యహం స్తపసఖా కిల కాలిదాసః ॥”

“కావ్యత్రయం సుమతి కృద్రఘువంశపూర్వమ్ ।

పూర్వం తత స్మృతి హితం శ్రుతికర్మవాదమ్ ।

జ్యోతిర్విదాభరణ కాలవిధానశాస్త్రమ్ ।

శ్రీ కాలిదాస కవితో హితతో బభూవ ॥”

“Yō Rūmakēśādhipatim Sakēśwaram jitvā grahitō
ijjayinīm mahāhavē

Aniya sambhrāmya, mumochatam twahō śriVikramārka
sama sahya Vikramah”

“Samkvādi panditavarāḥ kavayastvanēkē

jyotirvidasya mabhavamscha Varāghapūrvāḥ

Sri Vikramārka nrupasamsadi mānyabuddhi

stairapyaham nrupasakhā Kila Kālidāsaḥ”.

“Kāvyaathrayam sumati krudraghuvamśa pūrvam
pūrvam tatassmṛuti hitam śruti karmavādam

jyotirvidābharana Kālavidhīna śāstram

Sri Kālidāsa Kavito hitatō babhūva”

In Jyōtirvidābharana, the author Kālidāsa mentions the names of the nine gems of the court of Vikramāditya in the following verse :—

శ్లో ॥ ధన్వంతరీ ధృపణ కామరసింహ శంకు ।
 వెతాలభద్ర ఘటకపర కాలిదాసా : ।
 ఖ్యాతోవరాహమిహిరో నృపతే స్సభాయాం
 రత్నానివే వరశ్చి నవ విక్రమస్య ॥

“ ధన్వంతరీ శుభణ కామరసింహ శంకు ।
 వేతాలభట్ట ఘటకర్పర కాళిదాసాః ।
 క్ష్యాతోవరాహమిహిరో నృపతే స్సభాయాం ।
 రత్నానివై వరశ్చి ర్నవ విక్రమస్య ॥ ”

Pandit Sri Krishna Miśra in his book ‘Jyōtisha phala ratnamālā’ Chapter I, verse 10 writes :

శ్లో ॥ “ శ్రీ విక్రమాకో జగతే తలేస్మిన్ ॥
 జీయా న్మనుప్రఖ్య యశా నరేంద్ర : ।
 పుపోషయ : కోటి సువర్ణతో మాం ।
 సబాంధవం సప్తతివస్తరాణి ॥ ” (1-10)

“అత్రాయాద్వా విశతగ్రంథమితిద్విసాహస్రం ।

నానావృత్తావచిత్రం కుర్మశ్రీవిక్రమార్కనృపకీర్తయే ॥ ” (1-11)

“శ్రీ విక్రమార్క జగతే తలేస్మిన్ ॥

జీయా నృమనుప్రఖ్య యశా నరేంద్రః ।

పుపోషయః కోటి సువర్ణతో ।

మాం సబాంధవం సప్తతివస్తరాణి ॥ ” (1-11)

“అత్రాధ్యాయాద్వాత్రింశద్ధృంధమిద్వివిసాహస్రం ।

నానావృత్తావచిత్రం కుర్మశ్రీ విక్రమార్కనృపకీర్తయే ॥ ” (1-11)

“Sri Vikramārkō Jagatētalēsmīn, jēyānmanuprakhya
 Yaśā narēndrah

pupōshayah Kōti suvarṇatōmām, sabāndha-
 vam saptati Vatsarāṇi (1—10)

“Atrādhyāyā dvāthrimśatgrandhamitirdvi sāhasram
 nānā Vritta Vichitram Kurmassri Vikramārka nrupakīrthyai.

“That emperor Vikramārka who maintained me and all my family and relations for 70 years bequeathing a crore of golden coins, who equalled the Manūs in renown; may the Emperor Vikramārka be victorious.” (Jyotiṣhaphala Ratna māla. 1—10).

“This book consisting of two thousand poems of various and diverse charming meters, comprising of thirty-two chapters, is written to embellish the renown and reputation of the Emperor, Vikramāditya ”. (Jyotiṣhaphala Ratnamāla 1—11)

From this it is clear the Emperor Vikramāditya reigned for a period of much longer than 70 years. The coronation of Emperor Vikramāditya did not occur in 57 B. C. as, Buhler in his writings alleged on the basis of his own conjectures. All Indian authorities accept the date 57 B. C., as the year of the inauguration of his era (named after him) and not the year of his coronation. According to the Bhaviṣhya Purāṇa the year of his coronation is Kali 3020 or 82 B. C. That he proceeded to Nēpāl in Kali 3044 or 58-57 B. C. and there inaugurated his Era, as stated in the Nēpāla Rāja Vamśāvali is indisputably correct as it is supported by many authorities.

Of the time of composition of Jyōtirividābharṇa Kālīdāsa mentions the years in Kali Era in the following verse.

“ वर्षे सिंधुरदर्शनांबरगुणे (3068) यांते कले-स्सम्मिते ।

मासे माधव संज्ञिकेच विहितो ग्रंथक्रियोपक्रमः ॥”

“వర్షే సింధురదర్శనాంబరగుణై (3068) ర్యాతే కలే స్సమ్మితే ।

మాసే మాధవ సంజ్ఞికేచ విహితో గ్రంథక్రియోపక్రమః”॥

“Varshē sindhuradarśanāmbaragunai (3068) ryātē Kalēssammitē

Māsē mādhava samjnikēcha vihitō grandha . kriyōpakramah ”.

I undertake to write this book in the 3068th year of Kali in the month of Viśākha i. e. 33. B. C.

According to the Siddhānta Sirōmaṇi :

“नंदद्रिंदुगुणांश्च (3179) विक्रमनृपस्यांते कलेर्वत्सरा :”

“నందాద్రిందుగుణాంశ్చ (3179) విక్రమనృపస్యాంతే కలెర్వత్సరాః”

“Nandādrindu guṇāmścha (3179) Vikrama nrupasyāntē Kalērvatsrāh ”.

The Vikrama era ends (and the Śālivāhana Era begins) in Kali 3179.

Please see the following books for the historical existence of Vikramāditya.

1. Bhaviṣhya Mahā Purāna.
2. Jyōtirvidābharāṇa, By Kālidāsa.
3. Siddhānta Siromaṇi By Bhāskrāchārya,
4. Nēpāla Rāja Vāmśāvali. (The Indian Antiquary Vol. XIII P. 411 ff.)
5. Jyotiṣaphalaratna mālā By Sree Krishṇamiśra,
6. Rājatharangini a historical treatise on the political history of Kāśhmīr. (By Kalhana pandit, the son of the priminister of Kāśhmīr.)
7. The texts of various commentaries on the Sathapatha Brāhmana.
8. Mahāvamsa—A Buddhist chronicle.
9. Ancient India of Ptolemy by Mc. Crindle.
10. Tradition of the country.
11. Yearly Almanacs or panchāngams of different parts of Bhārat.

All these authorities declare unanimously and unequivocally that the Emperor Vikramārka is a historical person, He lived from Kali 3000 (101 B. C.) to Kali 3120 or 19 A. D. (For full particulars of the above, Please vide “Chronology of Kāśhmīr History Reconstructed” By this Author in English).

Emperor Vikrama lived a complete life of 120 years. We have to admit the correctness of the following dates therefore,

	Kali	B. C.
Amsuvarma's coronation	3000	101
The reign of Amsuvarma	3000—3068	101 -- 33
The birth of Vikramāditya	3001	101
Coronation of Vikramāditya	3020	82
His progress to Nēpāl and inauguration of his era	3044	57
The date of composition of Jyōtirvidābharana in which Vikramāditya is mentioned (By Kālidāsa).	3068	33
The reign of Amsuvarma, Kali	3000—3068	101 -- 33.
The reign of Vikramārka	3020—3120	82 -- 19 A.D.

It is clear from the above figures that Amsuvarma and Vikramāditya were contemporaries during the period 3020-3068 Kālī ruling at Nēpāl and in Ujjain respectively. There is no improbability or inconsistency in their meeting in Kālī 3044. It is not necessary to presume according to Buhler's conjecture that Amsuvarma preceded Vikramāditya. Some of the western scholars thus present a distorted account of ancient Indian history and deceive the innocent Indians themselves who are ignorant of the original texts of Indian authorship which after all form the inescapable source of all our information regarding our past. Mis-statements of fact due to error or ignorance may be condoned but deliberate distortions of the histories of other countries by scholars, however eminent should not be tolerated.

In the face of authoritative accounts of the ancient history of our country in unequivocal statements and rejecting them as unreliable and relying on the writings of the Chinese traveller, Heun-tsang, who visited India seven centuries after Amsuvarman's time, which contained the information which he gathered even according to him, to the best of his ability, and as he understood, from writings in the other languages, of which he was professedly ignorant, and misinterpreting the references therein to Amsuvarman who is stated there to have ruled in Nēpāl, and even interpolating and adding to such statements of Heun-tsang other statements not actually made

by him, Dr. Buhler has arrived at his own absurd and inconsistent conclusion that Amsuvarman belonged to the time of Heun-tsang or the time of his visit to India.

It has to be admitted that in the writings of Heun-tsang we find many statements from hearsay and conjecture and therefore inaccurate and erroneous; therefore we need not accept as authoritative every thing we find in his history and we have to make the necessary corrections before we use them for purposes of history. This is the advice in the matter given by General Cunningham who says in his *Ancient Geography of India* Ed. 1924 p. 371—"In this part of the pilgrim's travels, the narrative is frequently imperfect and erroneous and we must therefore trust to our own sagacity, both to supply his omissions and to correct his mistakes."

"As an instance of his (Fa-Hien's) unreliability they refer to his account of the Buddhism of Khotan. 'Whereas it is well-known, they say, 'that the Khotaners from ancient times till now have been Mohammadans;' as if they could have been so 170 years before Mohammad was born and 222 years before the year of the Hegira; and this is criticism in China" —(Page 5 of the Introduction to the *Travels of Fa-Hein* by James Legge).

The history of a country should not be based on the writings of foreigners. In the reconstruction of the history of any country the literature of that country should form the essential basis and not the writings of foreigners inevitably vitiated by ignorance and half-knowledge or superficial understanding. It is a misfortune that the history of India should have had to be reconstructed by western (European) scholars relying on such writings of foreign visitors to the country of earlier times. That we should still cling even to this day to such foundations is proof of our degeneracy and intellectual slavery from which, we have not yet freed ourselves. However long the period of their sojourn in our country it would obviously be very difficult for foreigners to be thoroughly acquainted with the customs and traditions of the native population. Rapson remarks as follows on the inaccuracies and errors in the writings of Megasthenes, the Greek ambassador at the court of

Samudragupta at Patna in 300 B. C. (Vide page 409 of Rapson's Cambridge History of India.)

"His separation of the Brāhmins into different castes according to their employment, priestly, administrative or political makes it difficult to suppose that he was reproducing what any Indian had told him."

"One member of Alexander's suite, Chares of Mytilene, his chief Usher, is quoted as saying 'the Indians worshipped a god 'Soraodeios' whose name being interpreted meant 'Maker of wine'. It is now recognised that the Indian name which Chares heard was "Sūryadēva" "Sun god". Some ill-educated interpreter must have been misled by the resemblance of 'Surya' = Sun to 'Sura' = wine." (page 422 of Rapson's Cambridge History of India).

"The account of the Brāhmins which Strabo extracted Megasthenes, does not completely agree either with the picture drawn in Indian literary sources or with the present day practice. Its discrepancies may be in part due to the misunderstandings of a foreigner." (Page 409 of Rapson's Cambridge History of India.)

"Megasthenes said, girls were marriageable and could bear children, at seven years old." (page 424 Rapson's Cambridge History of India.)

When there is no alternative, that is, in the absence of any alternative by way of any indication in the writings of native authors or in the traditional accounts of the people, we may be obliged to resort to, and rely on, such portions of the writings of foreigners as are not inconsistent with our known customs and traditions and appear to us historically authentic but when authoritative evidence is available in the literature of our country, we need not accept as authorities any alleged contemporary records or opinions of foreigners of doubtful meanings or interpretations by foreigners, of our inscriptions. They may be useful to corroborate the truth of conclusions

independently arrived at but cannot constitute by themselves reliable historical authority.

So the conclusion of Dr. Buhler, based on his own conjectures and flimsy arguments, that king Amśuvarman of Nēpāl belonged to the 7th century of the Christian Era is to be rejected as unacceptable. No weight should be attached to such ambiguous and conjectural matter. We cannot accept his own authority for his opinion that the writing (script) of the inscription in which Amśuvarma and Vibhuvarma are mentioned indicates the sixth or seventh century of the Christian Era for the writing. There are many wide differences of opinion in the matter of fixing the time of the writing from the nature of the script. Such opinions are all based more or less on conjectures and not supported by an independent authority. All the determinations of the dates of historical events (of ancient Indian History) by western (European) scholars have been influenced by and calculated to support, their basic, unproved and erroneous hypothesis that Alexander of Macedon who continued his conquests to the frontiers of India in 326 B.C., was a contemporary (slightly older) of Chandraguptha of the Maurya dynasty. That Alexander's contemporary Indian ruler was not Chandraguptha of the Maurya dynasty but Chandragupta and Samudraguptha of the Guptha dynasty is our contention and with the establishment and acceptance of this correct identification all the important dates of the events of ancient Indian history written by the western historians will be rendered wrong and incorrect by the difference in time of the two Chandragupthas of the Maurya and the Guptha dynasties respectively i. e. by 1207 years. Hence the writings of the western scholars based on their opinions, of the dates of inscriptions biased by their obsession of and desire to support the correctness of the original hypothesis of the contemporaneity of Alexander and Maurya Chandraguptha are unacceptable for historical purposes.

In rejecting the unequivocal statements of Nēpāla Rāja Vamśāvali, giving the dates of events in years of the Kali Era, on flimsy grounds and inconsistent arguments and attempting

to fix the times of the kings of Nēpāl mentioned in the lists of the Vamśāvali on the basis of his own conjectural opinions of the times of the scripts of inscriptions mentioning them Dr. Buhler is guilty of gross betrayal and distinct disservice to the cause of History.

Many mistakes and errors in history have resulted from inaccurate translations of the writings of the Chinese and other pilgrims who visited our country in ancient times.

How a translator can spoil the subject and mislead the reader on important questions can be seen from several English translations of works in other languages on Indology. 'Saucha' (1915) who translated Alberuni's History of India has altogether omitted the names of Bhaskaracharya, and his father Mahadeva and has instead mentioned Vitteswara and his father Bhadatta, which are not at all found in Weber's History of Indian Literature or in the original work of Alberuni. This he had done as he could not understand how Bhaskaracharya who according to western historians belonged to the 12th century A. D., could have been the author of a work translated in the 9th century A. D. It has been proved by us in our Kali Saka Vignana (Part I, pages 73-75) that Bhaskara belonged to the 5th century A. D. The same might not have been proved by the time of Saucha. But a historian or translator of History must be open-minded and leave the readers freedom of further research but should not close further chances of certain riddles being solved.

So we cannot fully trust the Westerners' translations of works relating to Indian history, originally written in the Chinese, Greek and other languages. (Vide Weber's History of Indian Literature P. P. 261, 262. Ed. 1878; and compare it with the English translation of Alberuni's History of India by Saucha, Ed. 1915; and vide The Astronomical Magazine Vol. 36. No. 4 April 1947, P. 278, Bangalore.)

It is stated (in the Vamśāvali) that the eighth king after Amśuvarman, one Varadēva was reigning in 3623 of the Kali Era and in his time Sankarāchārya visited Nēpāl. This

cannot be the Ādi-Sankarāchārya. Perhaps he was one of the contemporary Heads of the Pīthās—religious institutions established by Ādi Sri Sankaracharya in the different parts of the country. The Vamśāvali States clearly that the original Ādi Sankarāchārya visited Nēpāl towards the close of the reign of Vriṣhadēva varma the eighteenth king after Bhūmivarma (Kali 1389 or 1712 B. C.), the first of the 5th Śōlār dynasty of Nēpāl. Details of the events will be given in the chronological lists of the kings.

It is also stated there that the Buddhist preacher Avalōkitēśwara also visitēd Nēpāl at the same time and that at this time Vriṣhadēva varma in whose reign these visits occurred, shifted his capital to 'Lalitha pattana'. The year Kali 3623 is specifically and clearly stated in the Vamśāvali on account of its manifest historical importance. There is no reason to question its correctness. But Dr. Buhler objects thus :—

“Amśuvarma, the first king of the Thākūr dynasty is stated to belong to Kali 3000 (that he ruled from 101 B. C., to 33 B.C.). And the eighth king of the dynasty 'Varadēva Varma' is alleged to be ruling in Kali 3623 i. e. 522. A. D. It means he points out, six-hundred years are stated to be covered by the reigns of eight kings (He says seven kings but in the list given by him Varadēva Varma is the 8th king). Hence he concludes that the Vamśāvali is full of absurdities and unacceptable and rejecting it and misinterpreting the dubious statements of Heun-tsang he brings down the time of Amśuvarma to the 7th century of the Christian era.

Amśuvarma was crowned in Kali 3000 or 101. B. C. Towards the end of the reign of the 8th king of the dynasty, Varadēva in Kali 3623, the Buddhist preacher Avalōkitēśwara visited Nēpāl according to the Vamśāvali. So the interval between the crowning of Amśuvarma and visit of Avalōkitēśwara towards the end of the reign of Varadēva works out to 3623-3000 = 623 years. On the average the reign of each King must have lasted 78 years. There is nothing inconsistent or absurd in this deduction if we take into account the proved fact of the longevity of the Indians of 2000 years back vouchē^d

by the statements of the Greek historians who claimed to have witnessed, with their own eyes, Indians living up to 130 to 200 years. Emperor Vikramāditya of Ujjain who was the contemporary of Amśuvarman and visited Nēpāl and inaugurated his era there was born in Kali 3001 and died in Kali 3120 having lived the full life of 120 years and reigned for 100 years. During his time Nēpāl and all other kingdoms of Bhārat were included in his empire though after his demise his empire broke up into 18 separate kingdoms. According to the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, the frontiers of his empire extended to—Badari Sthān in the North, The city Kapila in the east, the Sēthu or cape Comorin (the sea) in the south and beyond the river Indus on the west. When the Emperor Vikramāditya ruled for 100 years, there is nothing improbable or inconsistent in the inference that his contemporary Amśuvarma and his seven successors on the throne of Nēpāl ruled on the average 78 years each.

Even otherwise if it is considered that this average length of 78 years for each reign is excessive, since the reigns of the sixth, seventh and eighth kings are not mentioned separately in the Vamśāvali but only the year Kali 3623 is attributed to the end of the reign of the 8th king, it may be suspected that some other kings also ruled and they have not been mentioned. Simply on the ground that the lengthy reigns attributed to some of the kings were not plausible in their opinion, to reject the entire text of the Vamśāvali as unreliable and to reconstruct the history of the country on the basis of the dubious writings of foreign visitors, supplemented freely by their own biased mis-interpretations and arbitrary conjectures is unworthy of a historian. It is a betrayal of the cause of history.

To an Indian there is nothing inconsistent or improbable in eight kings ruling for 623 years on the whole or 78 years each on the average. There are many instances of the kind in Indian literature. We submit that it is improper to reject the historical value of the Vamśāvali simply because it does not fit in with the unreasonable opinions based on ignorance and half-knowledge and flimsy arguments of these Western scholars.

Instead of the arbitrary and baseless reconstruction of the history of the country by the western scholars which is now accepted and passes for history, it will be more reasonable and less harmful to truth to add to the eight kings of the dynasty as many more as would bring the average reign of each within the limits acceptable to them. Dr. Buhler exhibits obvious anxiety to reduce the length of the reigns mentioned in the Vamśāvali and thus the antiquity of Indian History on the whole and not to reconcile the details given with the general outline of the time scheme elaborated in the Vamśāvali. Instead of disputing the historical value of the Vamśāvali altogether and building up the history of Nēpāl mainly on the basis of conjectures it is certainly more desirable to resort to an interpolation by way of emendation which stands to reason and reconciles the conflicting details and retains the historical value of the source book.

Amśuvarma is stated to be the contemporary of Vikramāditya. Vikramāditya is known to have inaugurated his era in Nēpāl, the era after his name, in the first century before Christ (57 B. C.). The Vikrama era has continued in use in our country even to this day. The Vikrama era is mentioned and used in the almanacs used in the different parts of the country in a continuous tradition year after year, generation after generation, and century after century. It is not difficult for us Indians to accept the time of Vikramāditya Kali 3001 as the time of Amśuvarma. There is no scope for the conjectures of Dr. Buhler in this matter. They should be rejected.

Amśuvarma was the founder of the Thākūr dynasty. The dynasty was firmly established on the throne of Nēpāl with the coronation of Amśuvarma in Kali 3000 or 101 B. C. The date and the documents in evidence of it must have been carefully preserved in the State archives of Nēpāl. They would not have been neglected and allowed to be tempered with. In Kali 3623 i. e. 522, A. D. the capital till then was abandoned and the king and his court shifted to a new capital named 'Lalitha Pattana. It was the year in which Śrī Sankarāchārya, the head of one of the religious establishments founded for the

preservation and propagation of the religion preached and established by Ādi Sankarāchārya in different parts of the country, visited the country, and established the Vēdic Dharma in the country. It was also the year in which the Buddhist preacher Avalōkitēśwara visited the country for the benefit of the Buddhists among the people.

Such memorable years kali 3000 and Kali 3623 will never be forgotten by the kings or the people of the country but cherished from time to time with pride and reverence. They should not be ignored or meddled with. Any other alternative hypothesis which leaves the dates undisturbed is to be preferred.

Advancing such flimsy and absurd arguments Dr. Buhler declares the Nēpālarājavamśāvali to be unreliable and useless for purposes of reconstructing the ancient history of the country and proceeding on the basis of his own conjectures reducing the periods of the reigns of the kings to bring them within the limits of what he felt to be reasonable, suggests that the history of the country should be reconstructed reckoning backwards from the Nēpālēse era supposed to begin in 880 A. D.

This procedure affords much scope for reducing the antiquity of the history of the country. On the other hand if a correct determination of the initial starting point is first attempted and then the times of the subsequent kings and important events are fixed with reference to it, the antiquity of the history of the country is fairly preserved. The western (European) scholars started with some arbitrary point in the history of India, determined its time wrongly to conform with their preconceived notions and prejudices and then making it the basis and reckoning from it forwards and backwards reconstructed the current accepted history of India which is full of many incorrect dates. Similarly Dr. Buhler deals with the history of Nēpāl and suggests :

“ It is therefore impossible to adopt, for the reconstruction of the earlier history of Nēpāl, the favourite expedient

of historians who have to deal with untrustworthy chronicles, and, while cutting down the duration of the several reigns to apparently resonable lengths, to count back-wards from the beginning of the Nēpālese era in 880, which has usually been considered as safely established”.

(The Ind. Antiquary Vol. XIII P. 418).

But instead, Dr. Buhler, as he had no faith in the correctness of the Nēpālēse era's inauguration in 880, (A. D.) discards it and considers it desirable to reckon backwards from the time of Amśuvarma's coronation which he locates in 637 A. D. as the recorded date of Kali 3000 is in his opinion improbable. His argument is given below in his own words.

“For, however safe that date (of the Nēpālēse era) itself may be, it has been shown above that the author of the Vamśāvali knew nothing regarding the events which occurred at the time when the era was established. A much firmer basis must be looked for, and this may be found in the reign of Amśuvarman, whose name occurs in the Vamśāvali, the inscriptions and Hieun-Tsang's memoirs, while his date is fixed, though in different ways, by the two latter sources. In his account of Nēpāl, Hieun-Tsang states that the reigning king belongs to the Lichchavi family and adds according to M. Stanislas Julien's translation – the following description of Amśuvarman 33.” (33, to be given in a footnote)

Foot-note 33 as follows :

“Mr. Beal, who has kindly furnished me with his version of the passage, renders it as following :

“Lately, there was a king called An-shu-fa-mo who was distinguished for his learning and ingenuity. He himself has composed a work on sounds (Sabda-Vidya), his esteemed learning and respected virtue, and his reputation was spread everywhere.” (G. B.) (See Beal's Bud. Rec. of W. Countries Vol. II p 81 conj. Julien Men. tome I, P. 408).

Dr. Buhler explains the above sentences in the following way:

"Now it cannot be doubted that the king referred to by Hien-tsang is the prince of this name whom the Vamśāvali places in Kaliyuga 3000 or 101 B. C. and whose inscriptions are dated Samvat 34, 39 and 45 (?). For, the Vamśāvali and the inscriptions know of one Amśuvarman only

"As the date of Hieun-Tsang's travels in India is fixed beyond doubt, and as his visit to Northern India most probably falls in the year 637 A. D. it follows that Amśuvarman must have reigned in the first half of the seventh century of our Era, and it must be noted that the characters of his inscriptions can belong to this period only. The author of the Vamśāvali has therefore antedated his reign by more than 700 years. The causes of this error probably lie partly in the fact that Amśuvarman's inscriptions are dated 'Samvat' which term, the compiler of the Vamśāvali erroneously referred to the so-called Vikrama Era of 57 B. C, and partly in the circumstance that the chronological system of the Vamśāvali, which makes the earliest kings of Nēpāl contemporaneous with the heroes of the Mahābhārata, made the displacement of all dynasties, excepting the very latest, a matter of necessity."

(Ind. Ant. Vol. XIII p. 420)

The gist of the above contention is to argue that the years of the Kali Era mentioned in the Nēpālarāja Vamśāvali have been erroneously given. Because the name of Amśuvarman is found in the Nēpālarāja Vamśāvali and the inscriptions and when Hieun-Tsang visited Nēpāl he found frequently on the lips of the people the memorable name of the famous Amśuvarman founder of the Thākūr dynasty who had lived and ruled seven centuries back, as he was unable to fix the date of Amśuvarman, he noted and recorded that there had been a great king of the name Amśuvarman and that he was a reputed Scholar but he never stated that the Amśuvarman mentioned was his contemporary or was reigning at the time of his visit. There seems to be deliberate corruption and confusion in the translation of Hieun-Tsang's writings into English by Dr. Beal. In the first words of Beal's translation of Hieun-Tsang's reference to Amśuvarman given in

the foot-note previously. 'Lately' there was a king called Amśuvarman (or Am-shu-fa-mo) there is the implication that the 'Anmśuvarman,' was not Hieun-Tsang's contemporary. It may be legitimately suspected that 'formerly' might be a more correct rendering of the original Chinese word than 'lately' and the inaccuracy may be due to loose translation. That the European scholars are naturally skilled (proficient) in propagating falsehood and that he had ample opportunities of observing their nature and tendency during many discussions with Hindu scholars has been the opinion expressed by prof. Max-Muller in his "India, what can it teach us"

Of the relative reliability and regard for truth, so essential a qualification for purposes of history, of oriental scholars and the writers of our Purāṇas and ancient books on one hand and the western scholars engaged in historical research and controversy on the other hand, a fair estimate is available to us in the words of Prof. Max Muller, himself, a well-known western scholar who interested himself in the ancient literature and religion of our country.

Prof. "Max-Muller" in his book "India, What can it teach us"? p. 63 writes thus :-

"During the last twenty years, however, I have had some excellent opportunities of watching a number of Native scholars under circumstances where it is not difficult to detect a man's character, I mean in literary work, and, more particularly, in literary controversy. I have watched them carrying on such controversies both among themselves and with certain European scholars, and I feel bound to say that, with hardly one exception they have displayed a far greater respect for truth, and a far more manly and generous spirit than we are accustomed to even in Europe and America. They have shown strength, but no rudeness; nay, I know that nothing has surprised them as much as the coarse invective to which certain Sanskrit scholars have condescended, rudeness of speech being according to their view of human nature, a safe sign not only of bad breeding but of want of knowledge. When they were wrong they have readily admitted their mistake; when they

were right they have never sneered at their European adversaries. There has been, with few exceptions, no quibbling, no special pleading, *no untruthfulness on their part* and certainly none of that low cunning of the scholar *who writes down and publishes What he knows perfectly well to be false, and snaps his fingers at those who still value truth and self respect more highly than victory or applause at any price.*

“Let me add that I have been repeatedly told by English merchants that commercial honour stands higher in India than in any of the country, and that a dishonoured bill is hardly known there.” (Vide India: What can it teach us? By Prof. Max-Muller. p. 63.)

The Late pandit N. Bhashyacharya is so outspoken on the treatment of oriental questions by many of the so-called savants that we cannot refrain from quoting a few of his observations :

1. “The writings of many of these orientalists are often characterised by an imperfect knowledge of Indian Literature, Philosophy and Religion and of Hindu traditions and *a contemptuous disregard for the opinions of Hindu writers and Pandits.* Very often facts and dates are taken by these writers from the writings of their predecessors or contemporaries, on the assumption that they are correct, without any further investigation by themselves. Even when a writer gives a date with an expression of doubt as to its accuracy, his follower frequently quotes the same date as if it were absolutely correct.”

II.

III. It is often assumed without reason that every passage in the Vedas containing philosophical or metaphysical ideas must be looked upon as a subsequent interpolation and that every book treating of a philosophical subject must be considered as having been written after the time of Buddha or after the commencement of the Christian Era. Civilization, philosophy and scientific investigation had their origin, in the opinion of these writers, within the six or seven centuries preceeding the Christian era, and mankind slowly

emerged for the first time from the depths of animal brutality within the last four or five thousand years.

IV. It is also assumed that Buddhism was brought into existence by Gautama Buddha. The previous existence of Buddhism, Jainism and A' rhat Philosophy is rejected as an absurd and ridiculous invention of the Buddhists and others who attempted thereby to assign a very high antiquity to their own religion. In consequence of this erroneous impression every Hindu Book referring to the doctrines of the Buddhists is declared to have been written subsequent to the time of Gautama Buddha ”.

(Vide ‘The Theosophist,’ Vol. IV, p. 304 et seq.)

Mr. T. S. Narayan Sastry, B. A. B. L., writes :—

“We have pointed out some of the defects in the methods of Western Orientalists and of their Indian followers in order to show to our countrymen how unsafe it is to rely upon the conclusions arrived at by these writers.

“We shall, as we proceed on, have occasion to point out several fallacies committed by them with respect to the age of Sankara in particular. It is unfortunate that whenever an ancient record conflicts with any of their hasty conclusions, they should try to misinterpret or discredit the record rather than revise their own conclusions. This is the only explanation we can give of the treatment accorded to the historical portions of our Purāṇās and Itihāsās as well as to traditions handed down from the oldest times.

(Age of Sankara Part I. A. p. 11. 12).

This natural tendency for propagating false theories and hypotheses is amply illustrated in their writings on Indian history. The history of Nēpāl is one such instance. It is clearly and definitely specified in the Nēpāla Rāja Vamśāvali that the coronation of Aamśuvarman was celebrated in Kali 3000 or 101 B. C. and during his reign the Emperor Vikramāditya of Ujjain visited Nēpāl and inaugurated his era there. This is corroborated by other evidence too. But this is

rejected on the ground that the reigns of the kings mentioned in the Vamśāvali are too long for him to believe to be true and alleging that the years of the events mentioned in the Nēpālēse inscriptions were wrongly attributed to the Vikrama era by the author of the Vamśāvali while he is inclined to identify the writing of the inscriptions as of the seventh century of the Christian era by the script used and it is found in the translations of Hieun-Tsang's description of his travels in Nēpāl, there is a reference to a distinguished and enlightened king by name Amśuvarman in former times and the term formerly must mean the time of Hieun Tsang's visit or just anterior to it and therefore Amśuvarman was likely to have been a contemporary of Hieun-Tsang and belonged to the seventh century reigning probably some time between 600 and 650 A. D., and the author of the Vamśāvali must have deliberately ante-dated Amśuvarman by seven centuries to place him in 101 B. C. Such arrogant allegations of untruthfulness against our ancient authoritative texts is an unpardonable insult. Dr. Buhler asks as if innocently what is the era to which the years 34, 39, 45 refer, which one finds in the inscriptions of Amśuvarman. It is clear this assumption of naivete is calculated to mislead the Indian historians.

The years specified in the inscriptions of Amśuvarman are not the years of the Vikrama Era. If the year 34 of the inscription is taken to belong to the Vikrama Era, the inscription is to be dated $57-34=23$ B. C. Amśuvarman is known to have died in 33 B. C., and it is impossible that one of his inscriptions should be dated ten years subsequent to his death. So the years 34, 39, 45 noted in the inscriptions are not the years of the Vikrama era. They can only be the years of his reign. In the 34th, the 39th and 45th years of his reign the three inscriptions were respectively prepared. Dr. Buhler's allegation that 'the years of the events mentioned in the Nēpālēse inscriptions were wrongly attributed to the Vikrama era by the author of the Vamśāvali' is not true. An account of the reign of each king was prepared by his court poet and the author of the Vamśāvali would have depended upon such accounts as were available of the reign of each king. In prepa-

ring his account of the events in the reigns of the kings of various dynasties, in his Nēpālarāja Vamśāvali he mentioned the facts as they were found in his sources where the information was clear and definite; and where he could not get at the names of certain kings, he kept silence and left the account blank but mentioned the historically important events definitely and unequivocally in Kali Era, tallying the lists of kings and the periods of their reigns with reference to such historical events of known dates and it is but proper that the book should be interpreted and conflicting items of information in it reconciled with reference to the years of the Kali era mentioned therein.

The Sri Harsha Era.

Another instance of a falsehood propagated by Dr. Buhler for misleading the Indians and constructing a wrong history of their country is seen in his treatment of the Sree Harsha Era.

Dr. Buhler writes :— "Though Alberuni, when speaking of the Sree Harsha Era, merely says that it is used in Northern India, and adds no information regarding its founder, it is certain that this personage can be no other but the hero of Bāna-bhatta's Sri Harsha Charita, whom his protegee, Hiçun-Tsang calls Harshavardhana or Silāditya."

(The Ind. Ant. Vol. XIII p. 421).

This is altogether wrong. Alberuni who was in India in 1031 A. D., has detailed in his History of India, the eras in use in the country in the previous times. He has stated that the Sri Harsha Era was current in Nēpāl and Northern India. We reproduce below the list of the eras given by Alberuni. He has converted every era into the Yazdagard era of the Persians, with reference to the year 400 Yazdagard era = 1031 A. D.

1031 A. D. equivalent to the year 400 of the Yazdagard era of the Persians, corresponds to the following years of the Indian eras :—

To the year of Sree Harṣha Era	1488	„	„	„
„ Vikrama Era	1088	„	„	„
„ Sālivāhana Era	953	„	„	„
„ Kali Era	4132	„	„	„

(Alberuni's India — translated by Dr. E. C. Saucha
Vol. II Ch 49, P. P. 4, 5, 7).

According to Alberuni's reckoning it is clear :—

1. Sri Harṣha Era (1488-1031) = 457 B. C.
2. Vikrama Era (1088-1031) = 57 B. C..
3. Sālivāhana Era (953-1031) = 78 A. D.
4. Kali Era (4132-1031) = 3101 B. C.

Alberuni further adds about the origin of Sri Harṣha Era in the following words :—

“His Era (Sri Harṣha Era) is used in Mathura and the country of Kanouj. Between Sri Harṣha and Vikramāditya there is an interval of 400 years, as I have been told by some of the inhabitants of that region” (Vide 'Alberuni's India By Saucha Ch 49. P. 5), i. e. 57 B. C. + 400 = 457 B. C., is the starting point of Sri Harṣha Era.

It is evident that the founder of Sri Harṣha era located thus in 457 B. C., cannot be the Sri Harṣha Silāditya of the 7th century A. D. But, Dr. Buhler complains that Alberuni has not given any helpful information and has not mentioned the founder of the Sri Harṣha era, and determines that the founder was the Sri Harṣha Silāditya commemorated by Bhatta Bāṇa the author of Sri Harṣha Charita. The founder of the Era mentioned by Alberuni belonged to 457 B. C., and the year 1488 of his era corresponds to 1031 A. D., according to Alberuni's specific wording. The name of the Era itself discloses its founder as 'Sri Harṣha'. But Dr. Buhler misinterprets even this detailed reference and exhibits Sri Harṣha the founder of the Sri Harṣha Era of 457 B. C., as the Sri Harṣha Silāditya of 606 A. D. And he has suppressed the fact that Alberuni fixed the inauguration of the Sri Harṣha Era in 457 B. C. There

was a Sri Harṣha Vikrama reigning in Ujjain in 457 B. C. He drove away the foreign Sakās and Hūnās and founded his own era. (Kali Saka Vijnānam, in Telugu, by Sri Kota Venkatāchalam Part I, pages 7, 66. and part III pages 40 to 44) (Vide 'Indian Eras', in English, by the same author).

The Sri Harṣha of the 7th century A.D., never founded an Era. Heun-Tsang who was a visitor at his court for a period of 15 years, honoured and respected as his preceptor, has nowhere stated that Sri Harṣha Silāditya founded an era. Bhatta Bāṇa the court poet who wrote the Sri Harṣha Charita also never, claimed that his hero founded an era. The existence of a Sri Harṣha Silāditya Saka inaugurated in the 7th century after Christ is itself altogether an invention of European historians and born of their anxiety to reduce as far as possible the antiquity of our civilisation. It is really baseless. It was never in use in our country either in historical treatises or in inscriptions and is altogether fictitious.

Dr. Buhler is obliged to build up a sequence of falsehood to support the Sri Harṣha era (of the 7th century A. D.) invented by him. He writes:—

“Our inscription No. 12, the first which belongs to Sivadēva II father of Jayadēva II is dated Sri Harṣha Samvat 119 or 725–6 A. D. The second No. 13 in which his name occurs was incised in Sri Harṣha Samvat 143 or 749–50 and No. 14 which has lost the king's name, but most probably belongs to Sivadēva II as the heir apparent of Vijayadēva, a vicarious name for Jayadēva bears the date Sri Harṣha Samvat 145.” (The Indian Antiquary Vol. XIII page 424.)

In inscription No. 12 of Sivadēva Varma Sri Harṣha year 119 is mentioned. This is wrongly identified by Dr. Buhler with the year 119 of the concocted era of Sri Harṣha Silāditya of the 7th century A. D., (which again is his own invention) and elucidated as corresponding to 725–26 A. D., to support his own fictitious theory. The facts are:—

The coronation of Bhūmivarma first king of the 5th Solar dynasty, occurred accor- ding to the Vamśāvali.	}	Kali 1389 or B. C. 1713
--	---	-------------------------------

The coronation of Sivadēvavarma the 27th king of this dynasty occurred accor- ding to the Vamśāvali.	}	Kali 2764 or B. C. 338
--	---	------------------------------

According to the writing in inscription 12.

in Sri Harṣha Samvat	119th year
	or B.C. 338

According to the Vamśāvali	Kali 2764 = 338 B.C.
----------------------------	----------------------

The year 119 of Sri Harsha era (457 B.C.) mentioned in inscription 12 (457-119).	338 B.C.
---	----------

So the evidence of the inscription 12 as well as of the Vamśāvali pointed to the same conclusion that the coronation of Sivadēvavarma took place in 338 B. C.

The year 143 of the Sri Harṣha era mentioned in inscription 13		314 B. C.
---	--	-----------

The year 145 of the Sri Harṣha era mentioned in inscription 14	}	312 B. C.
---	---	-----------

We submit it is neither fair nor honourable for this historian to set aside the clear evidence of the Vamśāvali corroborated by the inscriptions too to the effect that the coronation of Sivadēvavarma occurred in 338 B. C., and interpreting the evidence wrongly and distorting it to postulate a non-existent Sri Harṣha Silāditya era in 606 A.D., and to correct the dates mentioned in the Vamśāvali to suit it and endeavour to reduce the antiquity of the period of the ancient history of our country dealt with in the Vamśāvali.

Conflicting and Absurd Argument of Dr. Buhler.

To show the absurdity of the argument of Dr. Buhler, some of the inconsistencies of his argument are presented below in a clearer form.

1. The coronation of Amśuvarma.

If we agree for a moment that the conclusion of Dr. Buhler is valid that whereas the writings of Hieun Tsang

indicates, as well as the style of the writing of Amśuvarma's inscriptions, that Amśuvarma belonged to the 7th century of the Christian era, but to enhance the antiquity of the time of Amśuvarma, the author of the Nēpāl Rāja Vamśāvali antedated it by more than seven centuries and located it in Kali 3000 or 101 B. C., we have to fix the time of Amśuvarma at the time of the visit of Hieun-Tsang to Nēpāl in 637 A. D.

(The Ind. Ant. Vol. XIII p. 420).

Of the 31 kings of the Sūrya Vamśi dynasty Sivadēva-varma is the 27th. His coronation is dated Kali 2764 or 338 B. C. In the inscriptions of Sivadēvavarma, his coronation is dated 119th year of the Sri Harṣha era. The Sri Harṣha of this era is not the Sri Harṣha (who founded an era) of 457 B. C., mentioned by Alberuni. This is Sri Harṣha Silāditya whose era is to be located in 606 A. D.

Sivadēvavarma's coronation according to the No. 12 inscription occurred in Sri Harṣha 119 = 606 A. D. + 119 = 725 A. D. Let us concede the validity of this fantastic position of Dr. Buhler also for a moment for the sake of argument.

Of the royal dynasties of Nēpāl, the Sūrya Vamśi dynasty is the fifth — Sivadēva Varma is the 27th of the 31 kings of this fifth dynasty. His coronation is dated according to Buhler in 725 A. D. Amśuvarma is the first of the sixth, the Thākūr dynasty; He was crowned according to the writings of Hiuen-Tsang as interpreted by Dr. Buhler in 637 A. D. Then,

27. Sivadēva Varma's reign	61	years.
28. Narēndra dēva Varma —	42	„
29. Bhima dēva varma	36	„
30. Viṣṇudēva varma	47	„
31. Viśwa dēva varma	51	„
<hr/>		
Total	237	Years.
<hr/>		

This is the period elapsed between Sivadēvavarma's coronation and Amśuvarma. Amśuvarma the first king of the

Thākūr dynasty (6th dynasty) is the son-in-law of the 31st king Viśwadēva varma of the Sūrya Vamśi Dynasty. (5th dynasty) According to the argument of Buhler Amsuvarma must have been crowned in 725 A.D. + 237 = 962 A.D. But according to the writings of Hieun-Tsang as Buhler stated above it is 637 A. D. i. e. 88 years before Sivadēva varma the 27th king of the 5th dynasty. (725 A.D.) How is it possible? These two versions are conflicting. It is thus seen that Buhler who accused the author of *Nepalaraja vamsāvali* of antedating Amsuvarma by more than seven centuries is himself guilty of post-dating him to that extent. Hence it is clear we cannot implicitly rely on the correctness of the writings of Hieun-Tsang. The arguments of Dr. Buhler quoted above are clearly the specious pleadings of a biassed foreigner to support his preconceived ideas and deliberate intention to reduce the antiquity of the history and culture of Bhārat and bring them within the recent past. They are unreasonable and due to his own invention, and not based on any authentic evidence. The extant observations of foreign travellers in India of ancient times from Megasthenes, Fa-Hiuan, Heun-Tsang downwards are not altogether reliable for the reconstruction of our ancient history. Due to the ignorance and half-knowledge of the original authors and the scribes of later times who copied the texts from time to time, as also owing to the errors due to ignorance and deliberate interpolation and misinterpretation of the translators into the European languages from the original Chinese, many mistakes have crept into them and rendered them practically useless for historical evidence. They cannot be accepted as authoritative for the reconstruction of another nation's history. The modern history of India, accepted as authoritative and recorded in our text books and taught in our schools and colleges, is full of many such egregious chronological errors and wrong determinations and it is high time it is all scrapped and a genuine attempt is made by honest and patriotic Indians to rewrite the history of the culture and civilisation of their country based on the authentic sources and evidence and the traditions of the people of the country and their secular and sacred literature,

Puranic History.

In our Purāṇās we find a clear and continuous record of the lists of kings of the many dynasties that ruled in the different parts of the country (in the different kingdoms into which it was divided in ancient times) and their reigns—from the time of the Mahābhārata war (3138 B. C.) with the details of the years of their coronation, the length of the reign of each king and of each dynasty of kings and other important events as well as the total intervals between the Mahābhārata War and the time of Mahāpadmananda of Magadha, from Mahāpadmananda to the commencement of the Andhra dynasty of emperors and to verify and tally and adjust any discrepancies in the account due to lapse of time and errors of scribes and interpolation of interested parties here and there we find references to the position of the Saptarshi mandala at the time of the important land-marks incorporated in the accounts. In particular the position and revolutions of the Saptarshi mandala at the time of the Mahābhārata War and at the commencement of the reign of the Andhra dynasty—are all clearly specified in our Purāṇās. Such references enable us to rectify any mistakes that might have crept into the accounts for any reason.

The Kali Era.

The Yudhiṣṭhira era was inaugurated in 3138 B. C., the year of the Mahābhārata War after which Yudhiṣṭhira, the victor was crowned the undisputed Emperor of Bhārat—the Kali era was established in the 37th year of the Yudhiṣṭhira Era—when his reign came to a close in 3102 B. C.—(exactly at 2 hours 27 m. 30 sc. on the 20th of February). The era established in Kali 26 or B C 3076, variously termed the Saptarṣhi era of Loukika Era or Yudhiṣṭhira Kāla era is well-known and in frequent use in our tradition and literature. Setting aside all these eras and the exact determinations of events on these eras in our Purāṇās, for the basic event of Indian history, the invasion of Alexander, the only historical fact concerning India within the knowledge of the western historians

of Europe is accepted and enthroned and that year 322 B. C., is wrongly determined to be the coronation of Maurya Chandragupta of Magadha and on this basis all other events of Indian history are determined and the entire history of our country has been pushed forward by 12 centuries. The real date of the coronation of Chandragupta Maurya is 1534 B.C., according to all the Hindu, Buddhist and Jain literatures. The contemporary Hindu king to Alexander in 326 B. C., is Chandragupta of the Gupta Dynasty but not Chandragupta Maurya of the 16th Century B. C.

Alexander's Invasion

Alexander, when he invaded India brought with him in his train several historians from his own country. They were naturally expected to praise his victorious exploits and to slur over his defeats. Those who mentioned his defeats in their writings or refrained from singing his glory, would have been summarily despatched by the General. Even of the writings of such historians, influenced by fear of drastic punishment for dispassionate truthfulness, and therefore full of falsehoods and one-sided versions of the historical events and personages and peoples of those times, only a few remnants have been extant and available to the later historians in stray extracts. On the basis of the stray extracts of their writings available in the writings of the later Greek historians, the recent European historians, with their pronounced and obvious national bias and prejudice against the antiquity of the eastern nations, have attempted to build up the history of the countries of the east. The history of India thus evolved by the western European historians and blindly accepted as gospel truth by their Indian disciples is full of exaggerations and perversions due to bias and prejudice. The Indian writers do not seem to have been aware of the invasion of India by Alexander, in particular. In the writings of ancient Indians (our Purāṇās) Alexander is nowhere mentioned. The facts of the so-called Alexander's Invasion of India seem to be :- Samudraguptha of the Guptha dynasty of Magadha was deprived of his right to the throne by his father Chandragupta and therefore he

left the Capital Pātalīputra (Pātna) and gathering an army of his own from among the inhabitants of the Punjab and the Saka and Yavana tribes of Kṣatriya origin inhabiting the region to the west of the Indus and considered Mlēcchās, (outcastes) on account of their having discarded the customs and traditions of the Hindu religion, was preparing to march with them upon his step brother (who was preferred by his father to him). At that time Alexander must have reached the western bank of the Indus through Kaffiristan and he must have encountered the youthful Samudraguptha even there (to the west of the river Indus) and sustained a crushing defeat and fled with his surviving soldiers but died broken-hearted on account of the disgraceful defeat even on his way, at Babylonia, without reaching home. The crossing of the Indus by Alexander, establishing his satraps in the Punjab, fighting with and defeating Porus, giving him back his kingdom magnanimously in admiration of his heroism, building up a fleet and sailing down the Indus and on the sea to the west—all these stories were fictitious and concocted by the western historians on flimsy evidence and calculated to feed their vanity and racial arrogance.

Further, incidentally, as a consequence of this fictitious version of Alexander's invasion of India, (326 B. C.) by presuming the contemporaneity of Alexander with the famous king of Magadha, Chandragupta of the Maurya dynasty (1534 B. C.), they have reduced the antiquity and chronology of the early history of India by 1207 years. In the same manner with regard to the History of Kāshmir, identifying the Kāshmir king Mihira-kula as a Hūṇa, and on the strength of the two forged inscriptions Nos. 164, 165 of Mandasor, they pushed forward his reign from the 8th century before Christ to the 6th century after Christ and determining the times of the several kings of Kāshmir of earlier and later times with reference to his time, ultimately reduced the antiquity of the history of Kāshmir by more than 12 centuries. Again in the same manner they have attempted to meddle with the history of the royal dynasties of Nēpāl which begins ten centuries before the Mahābhārata War and brought it down to later times. For

this purpose and with this motive only Dr. Buhler attempts to assign Aṃśuvarma of Kali 3000 or 101 B. C., to the 7th century after Christ. *But his attempt has proved a boomerang (or a Bhasmasura's boon) to destroy his own thesis and also, incidentally, the reliability of the writings of the Chinese travellers of ancient times for historical purposes.* Thus to a careful and patient student of Indian literature it will be clear that the so-called Indian History we are taught is absolutely unreliable and false being based on deliberately distorted versions and perverse interpretations of historical facts and records.

Brother historians and researchers into the early history of India at least now discard the false versions of Indian history fabricated by western European scholars and their methods of enquiry; carefully study, with the help of the yet unperverted scholars of your country, of the traditional type, the vast body of Indian literature, imbibing the spirit and ideals of your traditional culture and rewrite the history of your country *de novo*. Otherwise you will deserve the reproaches of the future generations of our countrymen.

Look at what Mr. Rookes says about "Alexander's conquest" in the preface to his valuable translation of "Arrian's History of Alexander's expedition". (Lond. Edition 1814).

"True History, like a faithful mirror, gives princes, as well as private men, an exact representation of transactions of past ages; but if partiality infatuates the historian or prejudice over-balances his judgement, his images appear monstrous and unnatural and we lose the only benefit we hope to reap from his labours. The story of "Alexander's invasion" is no less than the fall of the vast Persian Empire, and the establishment of the Grecian upon its ruins. No period of time was ever so famous; no General ever pushed his conquests so far and in so short a time nor over-ran so many countries with so small a force. None had a more numerous race of writers to commend his acts to posterity; but the greater part

of their compositions was either panegyric or satire; for none durst write the truth concerning his reverses while he lived, and few seem to have had an inclination to it after his death" (Quoted by T. S. Narayana Sastry in his 'Age of Sankara Part I Ch. I, pp. 98, 99).

"Alexander never penetrated into India, farther than Taxila, which is not even quite the modern Attock; The murmuring of the Macedonian troops began at the same place and not, as given out by Mr. Vincent Smith and his ardent admirers at Hyphasis. For, having never reached Hyphasis or Jhelum, he could not have been at Hydaspes or Suttlej. Nor did Alexander ever found Satrapies, plant any Greek colonies in the Punjab. The only colonies he left behind him that the brahmins ever knew of—and that too not during the time of Chandragupta of the Maurya dynasty, but during the reign of Chandragupta of the Great Gupta dynasty, who drove these bold foreigners out of India, amounted to a few dozens of disabled soldiers, scattered here and there on the frontiers; who, with their native raped wives, settled down around the deserts of Karmania and Gadosia the then natural boundaries of India. And, unless history regards as colonists the many thousands of dead men, destroyed by the young prince, Samudragupta during his short period of exile from the court of his ambitious and jealous father Chandragupta, the founder of the Gupta dynasty, and those who settled themselves for ever under the hot sands of Gedrosia, there were no other, save in the fertile imagination of the so-called historians and their warm advocates the modern European orientalists. The boasted "invasion of India" was confined to the region between Karmania and Attock — East and West, and Beluchistan and the Hindukush South and North, countries which were all "India" for the Greeks of those days. His building a fleet at Hydaspes is a fiction; and his victorious march through the fighting armies of India—just another of the same kind." (Age of Sankara Part I by T. S. Narayana Sastry, Ed. 1917. pp. 96, 97.)

"While the western historian puts together the mutilated incomplete records of his nations, and people, and

weaves them into a clever mosaic according to the best and most probable plan, he rejects entirely traditions of other nations as fables and grandmother's stories. But the Hindu scholar pays not the slightest attention to the vain self glorification of alleged conquerors or their lithic inscriptions and panegyrics. Nor does he follow the stray bits of so-called historical information, oft concocted by interested parties and found scattered here and there in the fragments of classical writers, whose original texts themselves have often been tampered with. Yet, pleasant it is after the brainless assaults to which Indian history and Indian literature have hitherto been subjected, assaults in which "abuse has been substituted for argument, 'and' flat denial for calm inquiry", to find that there remain in the west some men who will come into the field like philosophers, and soberly and fairly discuss the claims of these classical writers to the respect due to truth and the dignity demanded for historical accuracy. Those alone whose sole desire is to speak out the truth and nothing but the truth, and not to maintain foregone conclusions and 'a priori' theories to suit their own purposes, have a right to a respectful hearing by the descendants of the Holy Sages of Bhārata-Varṣha."

(Age of Sankara Part I, pp. 97, 98),

Alleging that the years of the Kali Era mentioned in the Vamśāvali are wrong and unreliable for historical purposes and mixing them up with dates and eras based on his own conjectures or hypothesis, Dr. Buhler has concocted his own theories and meddled arbitrarily with the text of the Vamśāvali so that it is rendered absolutely useless for historical purposes. His criticism and his arguments are obviously those of an ignorant and uneducated man and unworthy of a scholar. Therefore it is the duty of Indians and Indian historians to review the Vamśāvali in a manner conformable to Indian culture, tradition and literature and revise the text to reconcile the references to the Kali era and thus render it useful for historical purposes.

To question the authenticity and hence the usefulness for historical purposes of the entire text, inconsistent matter

has been deliberately interpolated into it and the dynasties mentioned therein have been freely distorted. Wrong and inconsistent dates have been inserted here and there and in turn these were subjected to criticism as though they formed part of the original text. Removing such interpolations and reconciling the references to the dates of the Kali era and the dates of the Sri Harṣa era mentioned in the inscriptions 12, 13, 14, we shall here attempt to prove the historical validity and value of the Nēpālārāja Vamśāvali.

The Chronology of the Vamśāvali

The chronology of the Vamśāvali is mainly based on the Kali era. But the dates of only the very important events have been clearly and unequivocally specified in the Kali era. Rejecting the conflicting dates of the intervening periods between these dates of importance specified in the Kali era as most probably due to mischievous interpolation of inconsistent matter with the deliberate intention of rendering the historical value of the entire text altogether questionable, and adjusting, correcting and reconciling the other references to the dates mentioned in the Kali era is the only proper course open to scholars and students of Indian history, and not to accept the inconsistent interpolated matter as authentic and to reject the entire Vamśāvali as unreliable on account of such inconsistencies. The latter is not the procedure worthy of a dispassionate and honest student of History and it cannot be valued as historical research work. So we should approach the Rāja Vamśāvali dispassionately and with the sole desire of ascertaining the true facts and attempt to establish by valid arguments the authenticity and historical value of the text of the Vamśāvali.

The text of the Nēpālārāja Vamśāvali is inscribed on lengthy sheets of paper rolled up and in it the names of the kings are written one after another and when any important historical event is noted, it is added under the name of the corresponding king. It is very easy to incorporate extraneous matter subsequently in such a situation and to reject them also circumstantial evidence and arguments will be available in the same.

Such interpolated inconsistent matter is thus distinguished and separated and the correct dynastic lists and the reigns of the kings are given below. The author of the Vamśāvali incorporated in the texts the dates and reigns of which he was sure and when he had no definite knowledge he satisfied himself with giving merely the names of the kings and the dates of the important historical events in years of the Kali Era. We have to reconcile the different kinds of information supplied by him and build up a chronological account of the royal dynasties of Nēpāl.

Lists of the kings of Nēpāl according to the Buddha pārvatiya Vamśāvali given by Dr. Buhler.

(Vide "The Indian Antiquary Vol. XIII p. 411 ff.)

I. Gopāla Dynasty.

Gōpāla dynasty or the Yadu Dynasty (Kṣhatriyās of the Gōpāla family) Total period 522 years.

Name of the King.		Years of Reign.
1. Bhukata mānagata Gupta.		88
2. Jaya Gupta	(son of 1)	72
3. Parama Gupta	(son of 2)	80
4. Harṣha Gupta	(„ 3)	93
5. Bhīma Gupta	(„ 4)	38
6. Maṇi Gupta	(' 5)	37
7. Viṣhnu Gupta	(„ 6)	42
8. Yakṣhagupta	(„ 7)	72
		<hr/> 522 <hr/>

No. 8 died childless and brought in 'the Ahīr dynasty' from Hindustan.

II. Ahīr Dynasty.

1. Varasimha	}	Years not given; possibly 200 years for the three kings.
2. Jayamati Simha		
3. Bhuvana Simha		

Conquered by the Eastern Kirāta dynasty which resided at Gōkarṇa and reigned for 1118 years.

III. Kirata (Kshatriya) dynasty.

1. Yalambara came in Dvāpara śēṣha 12 i. e. 12 years were left of the Dvāpara yuga, obviously this seems to be a mistake. The 6th king of this dynasty is stated to have lived in the forest with the Pāṇḍavās and the 7th king is stated to have taken part in the great Mahābhārata War. The war took place 36 years before the close of Dvāpara and it is obviously impossible that while the 7th king supported the Pāṇḍavās and fought and died in the great war, (3138 B.C.) the first king of the dynasty could have been reigning 24 years subsequently i. e. 12 years before the close of Dwāpara. This is an apparent absurdity. Evidently it has been incorporated deliberately into the text with a view to render the authenticity and historical value of the entire text questionable and could not have been written by the original author. The book was obviously written by a scholar and no ignoramus and no Indian scholar with any sense of historical sequence could have been guilty of such a gross blunder in the narration. Either the note should be deemed an interpolation and rejected or the figure must have been wrongly or mischievously corrected into 12.

The list then proceeds thus

2. Pavi son of 1.
3. Skandara son of 2.
4. Valamba son of 3.
5. Hriti son of 4.
6. Humati son of 5. (went into the forest with the Pāṇḍavās (50 years before Kali i. e. 3151. B. C.)

7. Jitēdāṣṭi son of 6 assisted the Pāṇḍavās in the Great War and was killed, (Date of the War 36 years before Kali, i. e. 3138 B.C.) In his time Sākya Simha Buddha came to Nēpāl. These seven kings reigned for 300 years.

Jitēdāsti the seventh king of the Kirātā dynasty supported the Pāṇḍavās and was killed in the Mahābhārata War. His death belongs therefore to the year of the Mahābhārata War i.e. 3138 B. C. This is an important historical fact. There is no reason to doubt or suspect it. It might as well be made the corner-stone for the edifice of the chronology of the royal dynasties of Nēpāl. The son, of Jitēdāsti who was killed in the war was crowned king of Nēpāl in 3138 B. C., Dharmarāja, the Victor in the Great war at Hastināpura, Sōmādi, the son of Sahadēva (son of Jarāsandha also killed in the war) of the Bārhadrādha-dynasty, in Magadha.

Brihadbala of the Ikṣhvāku dynasty in Ayōdhya were all crowned in 3138 B. C. while Gonanda II had been crowned in Kāṣhmīr 2 years earlier. The Mahābhārata War of 3138 B.C., is an indisputable historical fact, vouched by the Purāṇās, the Epic Mahābhārata, the history of Kāṣhmīr and the history of Nēpāl. But it is stated in the Nēpāl Rāja Vamśāvali that in the time of this Jitēdāsti Sākya-simha Buddha visited Nēpāl. The Buddha known to history is Gautama-Buddha. He was the son of Suddhōdana the 23rd of the list of the 30 kings of the Ayōdhya dynasty. The purāṇās all unanimously declare that the 30 kings of the Ayōdhya dynasty ruled for 1500 years from the time of the Mahābhārata War. On the average it works out to 50 years for each king of the dynasty. So the 23rd king Suddhōdana must have ruled about 1200 Kali. The birth of Gautama Buddha has to be located therefore somewhere near Kali 1215 or 1287 B. C. To the Sākya Simha Buddha who is stated in the Nēpāl Rāja Vamśāvali to have visited Nēpāl in the time of Jitēdāsti prior to the Mahābhārata War must be some other Buddha and not Gautama Buddha of history. It is a fallacy of the historians to presume that the Buddha religion came into being with Gautama Buddha. These historians disregarded and looked askance at the Purāṇās as unreliable and this has led to many errors in their histories and much confusion. That the Buddhas were many and that there were many incarnations of the Buddha previous to Gautama Buddha and that in future there will be many more such incarnations of the Buddha have been declared often by the Buddhist religi

ous books. The Hindu Purāṇās also say that the first naked Sanyāsi (ascetic) from the time of the creation was Rishabha. To preach the philosophy of the ultimate reality to the Rīṣhis he became a naked ascetic, an ascetic of the utmost severe type of asceticism. But the ignorant people could not understand him and his message and doctrine and only imitating the external features of his practice like shaving the head, wearing of ochre robes etc., gave up the ritual prescribed by the Vēdās, established and propagated the unvēdic Bauddha and Jaina schools of thought—according to the Purāṇās. In the first Amśa of the fifth canto of Mahā Bhāgavata the account of the Rīṣhabha incarnation may be referred to in this connection. For the Jains Rīṣhabha is the first Arhat. The Jaina and Bauddha religions were not originated in our country by Mahavira and Gautama Buddha. They were only able propagandists and popularisers of their respective cults. In the list of religious teachers of the Bauddha religion from times immemorial there might have been a Buddha known as Sākyaśimha in the time of Jitēdāsti before the Mahābhārata War and he might have visited Nēpāl. This should not be rejected as untrue by us ignorant of the history of the times. It is also not unlikely that this inconsistent detail is due to deliberate interpolation by interested parties intent on rendering the whole text of Nēpāl Rāja Vamśāvali untrustworthy and unreliable for historical purposes. In that case it should be deleted from the text. But to reject the entire text as unreliable on account of this inconsistency is absurd. We have to bear in mind that the Buddha who is alleged to have visited Nēpāl in the time of Jitēdāsti was Sākyaśimha Buddha and not Gautama Buddha of history. Gautama Buddha was known by the name Sākya Muni but nowhere is he referred to as „Sākyaśimha.

“When the true doctrines have fallen into decay and man-kind has become evil, there appears at long intervals, a new Buddha to resume teaching of the same doctrines of salvation. The Buddha Siddhārtha is said to have been preceded by as many as twenty-four Buddhās, the last of which was Kāśyapa; and five thousand years after the passing of Buddha into Nirvāṇa, a new Buddha Mitrēya, will arise.”

(quoted by Harnesworth in his History of the World Vol. IV. India, Ceylon, Central Asia and Ancient India, Page 1196).

“When the world-honoured one (Sākya Muni) was about to attain to perfect wisdom, the Dēvās sang in the sky, “The son of Suddhōdana, having quitted his family and studied the path (of wisdom) will now in seven days become Buddha. The pratyēka Buddha heard their words, and immediately attained to Nirvāna.” (Record of Buddhist-kingdoms by Fa Hien—Translated by James Leggie, Ed. 1886 - Page 94).

Foot-note on page 94 runs thus:—

“This is the only one instance in Fahien’s text where the Bodhi Sattva or Buddha is called by the surname ‘Gotama’. For the most part, our traveller uses Buddha as a proper name, though it properly means ‘The enlightened’. He uses also the combination Sākya Buddha = The Buddha of the Sākya tribe and Sākya Muni = the Sākya Sage’. This last is the most common designation of Buddha in China.” Among other Buddhistic peoples Gotama, and Gotama Buddha are the more frequent designations.”

Dr. Rhys Davids—In Buddhism page 27 says ‘The family name was certainly ‘Gautama.’ “The king exhibits, so as to line both sides of the road, the five hundred different bodily forms in which the Bōdhisatva has in the course of his history appeared here as ‘Sudāma, there as ‘Sāma’ etc. (Vide Fa-Hien By James Leggie p. 106) Foot-Note I. on p. 106 :—

Sudama or Sudatta was the name of the Bodhi-Sattva in the birth which preceeded his appearance as Sakyamuni or Gotama, when he became the supreme Buddha.

“The thousand Buddhas of this Bhadra Kalpa, indeed will all use the same almsbowl.” (P. 110 of Fa-Hien’s travels by Leggie.)

The three predecessors of Sakyamuni. 1. Kaśyapa Buddha, 2. Kra-Kuchanda Buddha, 3. Kanakamuni Buddha,

These three predecessors of Sākya Muni were the three Buddhās of the present or Mahābhadrā Kalpa, of which he was the fourth and Mitrēya is to be the fifth and last. (Vide Footnote 2 of page 51).

Suddhōdana is the father of Sākya Muni.

(Foot-note 4 on page 64).

It is of him (Kāśyapa Buddha) that the Chapter XXXIII speaks, and not of the famous disciple of Sākyamuni, who is also called Mahākāśyapa'. (Foot-note 3 on page 92, continued in page 93 of Fa-Hien by James Leggie).

From the above authoritative passages it is clear there were many incarnations of the Buddha and Buddha son of Suddhōdana, otherwise known as Gautama Buddha or Sākya Muni is nowhere called Sākya Simha. According to Buddhist Purāṇās (sacred texts) the current Bhadrā Kalpa is of 23 crores 60 lakhs years duration of which 19 crores 10 lakhs of years are passed. During this period (of the current Bhadrā Kalpa left behind one thousand incarnations of the Buddha appeared. Sākya Simha was very probably one of those. He must have appeared slightly after or before the Mahābhārata War. The Western scholars have been under the impression that the son of Suddhōdana was the only Buddha. So they wrongly identified the Sākya Simha Buddha mentioned in the Nēpālā Rāja Vamśāvali as having visited Nēpāl during the reign of Jitēdāsti about the time of the Mahābhārata War as the Sākya Muni Buddha the son of Suddhōdana the 23rd of the kings of the Ayōdhya dynasty who ruled after the Mahābhārata War and questioned the possibility of the fact and hence the authenticity of the entire text of the Nēpālā Rāja Vamśāvali. When once we recognise that Sākya Muni and Sākya Simha were different there is no confusion and no inconsistency. The rest of the kings of the Kirāta dynasty are :-

8. Gali son of 7 (Jitēdāsti) crowned 36 years before Kali or 3138 B. C.
9. Puṣhka son of 8.
10. Suyārma son of 9.

11. Parba son of 10.
12. Thunka son of 11.
13. Svananda son of 12.
14. Stunco son of 13.

In his time king Aśoka of Pātaliputra came to Nēpāl; Aśoka's daughter Chārumati was married to a Kṣatriya, called Dēvapāla, settled in Nēpāl and founded Dēvapattana (near Paśupati). This is nonsense. It is a big forgery and deserves to be wiped off from the Vamśāvali.

Aśoka who belongs to a period 16 centuries after the Mahabharata war is introduced here and the Vamśāvali is unfairly subjected to criticism. It is clear this could not have been written by the author of the Nēpāla Rāja Vamśāvali in the original text. The list continues thus:—

15. Gighri (Gidhri) son of 14.
16. Nane son of 15.
17. Luk son of 16
18. Thor son of 17.
19. Thoko son of 18.
20. Varma son of 19.
21. Guja son of 20.
22. Puṣhkara (Puṣhka) son of 21.
23. Kēsu son of 22.
24. Snusa son of 23.
25. Sammu son of 24.
26. Guṇana son of 25
27. Kimbu son of 26
28. Patunka son of 27.

He was attacked by the Sōma-Vamṣi Rājputs, built a new fort at Sankamūla thirtha.

29. Gasti son of 28 fled before the Sōmavamṣis, built a new fort at Bhūtōchcha near Godavari, visible from Lalitapattana, and finally lost his kingdom to the Somavamṣi dynasty,

These 8 to 29 kings reigned for 782 years in Kali and 36 years before Kali, total 818 years. (i e, From 36 before Kali to Kali 782 or 3138 B. C. to 2356 B. C.)

IV. Soma - Vamsi Dynasty.

(reigned 607 years. Kali 782-1389. 2356-1749 B. C.)

1. Nimiṣha.
2. Mānākṣha son of 1.
3. Kāka Varman son of 2.
4. Paśuprēkṣha Dēva son of 3 restored Paśupati's temple, brought over settlers from Hindusthan in Kali-yuga 1234 or 1867 B. C.

5. Bhāskara Varman conquered the whole of India, enlarged the Dēvapattana, caused the rules for the worship of Paśupati to be engraved on a copper plate, which he deposited in the Chārumati Vihāra. Being childless he adopted a prince of the Sūryavamśi dynasty, Bhūmivarman who was crowned king in Kali 1389 or 1712 B. C.

According to the Nēpāla Raja Vamśāvali Paśuprēkṣha dēva was the fourth king of the IV Somavamśi dynasty. In Kali 1234 or 1867 B. C., he induced people from Hindusthan to migrate to Nēpāl, provided for them and settled them there. There is nothing to question the correctness of this statement or object to it as improbable. It might have so happened at that time. Only we have to note the date. The fifth king of this dynasty Bhāskara Varman was childless and adopted therefore Bhūmivarman according to the Vamśāvali. This Bhūmivarman was crowned in Kali 1389 or 1712 B. C. The years of the reigns of the individual kings of the Somavamśi dynasty are not given. The year mentioned in the 4th king's reign is Kali 1234 or 1867 B. C. The year of the coronation of Bhūmivarman is Kali 1389 or 1712 B. C. To account for the interval between the two dates mentioned—of 155 years only one king the 5th king Bhāskaravarman is mentioned. During this interval 2 or 3 kings might have reigned but perhaps the author did not know, or could not trace the names of the rest

and so he mentioned only Bhāskara varman and omitted all mention of the rest. He has clearly and definitely mentioned the dates of two important historical events one in Kali 1234 and the other in Kali 1339. We have to accept these two dates and surmise the existence of 2 or 3 kings not mentioned in the list, but we are not warranted on the ground of this slight omission and gap to question the authenticity and historical value of the entire text of the Nēpāla Rāja Vamśāvali and build the entire history of the country merely on conjectures and questionable interpretations.

The establishment of the Sūryavamśi dynasty in Kali 1389 or 1712 B. C., the crowning of the first king of the dynasty Bhūmivarman and the transfer of the capital to the city Baṇḍēśwara are three important historical events. So the years of these important events were vouched by authentic evidence in the records of the royal house and noted specifically, definitely and unambiguously in the text. This should not be discarded or overlooked.

In the reign of Vṛiṣhadēva Varma, the 18th king of the fifth Sūrya vamśi dynasty the first Sankarāchārya travelled from the south to Nēpāl, defeated the Buddhist priests there in religious discussions, and reduced the influence and hold of the Budhistic religion on the popular mind. The reigns of all the kings individually are given definitely and clearly from the first king of the fifth Sūrya Vamśi Dynasty, from Bhūmivarman to the 18th king Vṛiṣhadēva varma. Reckoning the periods allotted to the different dynasties from the time of the Mahābhārata War and again from Kali 1389 (thus arrived at) of the time of Bhūmivarman the first king of the Sūrya vamśi dynasty reckoning the reigns of the 18 kings of the dynasty down to Vṛiṣhadēvavarma it works out to Kālī 2554 to Kālī 2615. The birth of Sri Sankara was in Kali 2593 (509 B. C.) and visit to Nēpāl Kali 2614 or 488 - 487 B. C. These figures tally remarkably accurately.

Thus it is verified that Sri Sankara lived towards the end of the sixth century before Christ and the beginning of the

fifth century before christ i. e. from 509 to 477 B. C., and the view of the western scholars that Sri Sankara belonged to the eighth century after Christ is shown to be altogether fantastic.

The Sankara of the 8th century A.D., described in the book "Sankara Mandāra . Sourabha" was not the Adi Sankarāchārya of (509 B. C.), but he was the 38th. Peṭṭādhipathi in the list of Kanchi Kāma Koti Peetha Counting from 'Adi Sankarāchārya'.

Age of Ādi Sankarāchārya.

(According to Jain and Buddhist Literature.)

The Jinavijaya says about the birth of Kumārila Bhatta as follows:

“ఋషి ర్వార స్తథాపూర్ణం మర్త్యాక్షౌ నామమేళనాత్ (2077) ।

ఏకీకృత్య లభేతాంకః క్రోధీస్యాత్ తత్రవత్సరః ।

భట్టాచార్య కుమారస్య కర్మకాండకవాదినః ।

జ్ఞేయః ప్రాదుర్భవస్తస్మిన్ వర్షే యౌధిష్ఠిరేశకే” ॥

“ऋषिवारं स्तथापूर्णं मर्त्याक्षौ वाममेलनात् (2077) ।

एकीकृत्य लभेतांकः क्रोधीस्यात् तत्रवत्सरः ।

भट्टाचार्य कुमारस्य कर्मकांडकवादिनः ।

ज्ञेयः प्रादुर्भवस्तस्मिन् वर्षे यौधिष्ठिरेशके” ॥

“Rishirvāra stadāpūrṇam martyākshau vāmamēlanāth
(2077)

Yēkikruthya labhētāmkah Krōdhīsyāt tathra vatsarah
Bhattāchārya Kumārasya Karmakāṇḍaka Vādinah

Jñēyah prādurbhavastasmin varshē Yaudhistirē śakē.”

(Jina Vijaya).

(Vide page 8 Sanskrit Chandrika under Mahakavi Kalidasa).

Meaning :- “We shall get the year ‘Krōdhi’ if we calculate the figures Rishi = 7, Vāra = 7, Pūrṇa = 0, Martyāksha = 2 in the reverse that year 2077 of the Yuddhistira saka (of the Jains) that Kumārila Bhattāchārya, the special advocate of Karma Kāṇḍa was born. (The Jains and Buddhists use a Yudhishtira era which commences 468 years after Kali is (commencement of Kali 3102 B. C. — 468 =) 2634 B. C. Hence Kumārila was born in 2077 + 468 = 2545 th Kali year or 557 B. C. (or 2634 B. C. — 2077 = 557 B. C.)

(Quoted by the learned T. S. Narayana Sastry, B. A., B L. in his “Age of Sankara P.P. 139, 140, Ed. 1917 A. D.)

About the birth-place and other particulars of Kumā-rila-Bhatta, the Jina Vijaya says:—

“ఆంధ్రోత్కలనాంసంయోగే పవిత్రే జయమంగలే ।

గ్రామే తస్మిన్ మహానద్యాం భట్టాచార్యకుమారకః ।

ఆంధ్రజాతిస్త్రితిరో మాతాచంద్రగుణాసతి యజ్ఞేశ్వరపితా ।

యస్య మహావాదిర్మహాన్ ఘోరః శ్రుతీనాంచాభిమానవాన్ ।

జినానామంతః సాక్షాత్ గురుద్వేష్యాతిపాపవాన్” ॥

“आंध्रोत्कलानांसंयोगे पवित्रे जयमंगले ।

ग्रामे तस्मिन् महानद्यां भट्टाचार्यकुमारकः ।

आंध्रजातिस्तित्तिरो माताचंद्रगुणासती यज्ञेश्वरपिता ।

यस्य महावादिर्महान् घोरः श्रुतीनां चाभिमानवान् ।

जिनानामंतः साक्षात् गुरुद्वेष्यातिपापवान्” ।

Āndhrōtkalānām samyògē pavitrē Jayamangalē

grāmē tasmin mahānadyām Bhattāchārya Kumārakah

Andhrajātistittirō mātāchandragnṇāsati Yajnēśwara pitā

yasya mahāvādirmahān ghōrah srutināmchābhimānavān

Jinānāmamtah sākshāt gurudvēshyāthi pāpavān.

(Jinavijaya),

Meaning:— “Kumarilabhatta was born in the sacred village, Jayamangala, on the bank of the river Mahānadi at the meeting-place of the Andhra and Utkala countries. (In those days the Andhra Province extended as far as the ‘Mahānadi’ which forms the boundary line between Andhra and Utkala (or Odhra Provinces). He was an Andhra by birth and belonged to the Vedic school of Thittirīya (Krishna Yajur-Veda Sākha). His mother was Chandraguṇā, the pious, and his father Yajnēswara. He was a great and terrible debator and a staunch adherent of the Vēdas. He lived among the Jains as their student and committed the heinous sin (of attacking the very religion of his Jain Gurus) and was therefore hated by them.”

(Jinavijaya),

Chitsukhāchārya says in his Bruhat Sankara Vijaya that Kumārila was older than Sankara by 48 years. As Sankara was born in 509 B. C., Kumārila was born in $509 + 48 = 557$ B. C., according to Sankara Vijaya also.

Two years after the death of Mahāvīra, Kumārila was pushed out into the street from the top of a terrace. The Jina Vijaya gives the date as follows :—

“సందాః పూర్ణం భూశ్చ నేత్రే మనుజానాంచవామతః (2109) ।

మేలనే వత్సరోధాతా యుధిష్ఠిరశకస్యవై ।

భట్టాచార్య కుమారస్య కర్మకాండస్యవాదినః ।

జాతః పరాభవస్తస్మిన్ విజ్ఞేయో వత్సరే శుభే” ॥

“నందాః పూర్ణం భూశ్చ నేత్రే మనుజానాంచవామతః (2109) ।

మేలనే వత్సరోధాతా యుధిష్ఠిర శకస్యవై ।

భట్టాచార్య కుమారస్య కర్మకాండస్యవాదినః ।

జాతః పరాభవస్తస్మిన్ విజ్ఞేయో వత్సరే శుభే” ॥

“Nandāh pūrṇam bhūścha nētrē manuṣānāṁcha vāmatah
(2109)

mēlanē vatsaró Dhāta Yudhishtira śakasyavy

Bhattāchārya Kumārasya Karmakāṇḍasya Vādinah

Jātah parābhavastasmin Vijnēyó Vatsarē śubhē.

(Vide Ibid. P. 3.)

Meaning :— Nandas=9, Pūrṇa=0, Bhumi=1, Netra=2 in the reverse order. 2109 years had elapsed in the Yudhishtira Saka of the Jains corresponding to the year Dhāta. It was in that auspicious year that Kumārila Bhattāchārya met with his fall.

The poet being a Jain is glad to think of the discomfiture of Kumārila in the hands of the great Jain Teacher and his worthy followers, and remembers the year as an auspicious one in the history of the Jainās, as the epithet (శుభే)

indicates. So this incident must have happened in the year 2109 of the Yudhishtira Saka according to the Jains, corresponding to 525 B. C., Kumārila must have been 32 years old at this time.

Referring to the date of Sankarāchārya's Niryaṇa, the Jina Vijaya states :—

“ఋషిర్బాణ స్తథాభూమి ర్మత్యాక్షౌ వామమేలనాత్ (2157) ।

ఏకత్వేన లభేతాంకం స్తామ్రాక్షౌ స్తత్రవత్సరః” ॥

“ऋषिर्बाण स्तथाभूमि र्मत्याक्षौ वाममेलनात् (2157)

एकत्वेन लभेतान्कं स्ताम्राक्षा स्तत्रवत्सरः” ॥

“Rishirbāṇa stadhā bhūmirmarthyākshau Vāmamēlanāth (2157)

Yēkatvēna labhētāmkam stamrākshā statra Vatsarah”.

(Ibid P. 6).

“When we calculate the figures Rishi 7, Bāṇa 5, Bhūmi 1, and Martyāksha 2. in the reverse order and obtain the total number of years 2157 in the Yudhishtira Saka (of the Jains), we arrive at the year Tāmṛāksha (Raktākshi) as the year of Sankara's death. (Quoted in His “Age of Sankara” Part I, B. at pp. 141, 142 By T. S. Narayana Sastry.)

It is plain from this that Sankara died in the year ‘Raktākshi’ corresponding to the year 2157 of the Yudhishtira Saka (according to the Jains)—the year $2157 + 468 = 2625$ of the Kaliyuga corresponding to 477 B. C., which is exactly the date given of Sankara's death in all the various Sankara Vijayams We know that Sankara died in his 32nd year, and so he must have been born in the year 2593 of the Kaliyuga, 2125 of the Yudhishtira Saka (according to the Jains corresponding to 509 B. C.)

Lastly referring to the extra-ordinary meeting of Sankara and Kumārila on his funeral pyre, the Jina Vijaya declares :—

“పశ్చాత్ పంచదశే వర్షే శంకరస్య గతేసతి ।
భట్టాచార్య కుమారస్య దర్శనం కృతవాన్ శివః” ॥

“पश्चात् पंचदशे वर्षे शंकरस्यगतेसति ।
भट्टाचार्य कुमारस्य दर्शनं कृतवान् शिवः” ॥

“Paschāt panchadaśē varshē Sankarasya gatē sati
Bhattāchāryā Kumārasya darśanam krutavān Sivah”.
(Vide Ibid p. 6)

“Thereupon, when 15 years had elapsed from his birth, Sankara met Bhattāchārya for the first and last time”.

(Quoted in his ‘Age of Sankara’ part I, B. page 142)
(By T. S. Narayana Sastry.)

The date of the birth of Sankarāchārya according to the Sankara Vijaya and the accounts kept by the Dwāraka and Pūri Mathās is 2593rd year of Kaliyuga or 451 before Vikrama Era of 58 B. C., or 509 B. C., as given below :—

“తిష్ఠ్య ప్రయాత్యనల సేవధి బాణ నేత్రే ।
యోనంద నే దినమణా వుదగధ్వభాజి ।
రాధేఽదితేరుదు వినిర్గత మంగలగ్నేఽప్య ।
హూతవాన్ శివగురుః సచ శంకరేతి” ॥

“तिष्ठे प्रयात्यनलसेवधि बाण नेत्रे ।
योनंदने दिनमणा वुदगध्वभाजि ।
राधेऽदितेरुदु विनिर्गत मंगलग्नेऽप्य ।
हूतवान् शिवगुरुः सचशंकरेति” ॥

Thishyē prayātya nalaśēvadhi bāṇa nētrē
Yōnandanē dinamaṇā udagadhwabhāji
rādhē 2 ditē rudu vinirgata mangalagnē 2 pyā
hūtavān Sivaguruh sacha Sankarēti”.

Meaning :— Anala = 3, Sēvadhi = 9, Bāṇa = 5, Nētrā = 2
which comes to 2593rd year of Kaliyuga or 509 B. C., etc.

“On Sunday, Vaiśākha Sukla Panchami in the constellation of Punarvasu, and in the lagna of Dhanus in the (Cycle) Year Nandana a son was born to Sivaguru and he was named “Sankara” by his father in 2593 Kali. This year corresponds to 509 B. C., (Vide “Epochs of the History of Bharata Varsha” By Jagadguru Sri Kalyanananda Bharati Māntachārya Swāmiji Maharaj. P. 130, Ed. 1931).

“Gōpāditya, (the Kashmir King) built the temple of Sankara called Sankarāchārya or Thakti Sulaiman (Kashmir) in 367-366 B.C.”

(Vide ‘A Short History of Kashmir’

(By P. Gwashalal, B. A.)

Pilgrimages in Kashmir.

Sankarāchārya—“This shrine is situated in the city of Srinagar. Sankarāchārya is an ancient temple crowning the Takti-Sulaiman hill and standing 1000 ft. above the valley. The temple and the hill on which it stands take their name from Sankarāchārya—the great South Indian Teacher of Monism, who came to Kāśhmīr from Travancore. This temple was built by king Gōpāditya who reigned in Kāśhmīr from 368 to 308 B. C. It was repaired later by the liberal-minded Muslim King Zain-ul-Abdin.”

(Vide ‘The Hindu’ dated 17-7-1949, Page 15, Column 2.)

The learned Pundit T. S. Narayana Sastry, B. A., B. L., High Court Vakīl in his “Age of Sankara” Part I, A. Page 29 ff. writes :—

“There have been many Sankarāchāryās all over the Advaitic Maths in India and many of them have been famous writers of works on the Advaita Philosophy and Religion. In the Kāmakōti-Pitha alone, one of the five Maths established by Ādi Sankarāchārya and originally located at Kanchi (Conjeevaram), but subsequently removed to Kumbhakōṇam, there have been up to this time 68 Āchāryās, who all bore the title of Sri Sankarāchārya and among whom there have been no less than eight Āchāryās who also actually bore the name of

Sankara. Of these latter again, the 38th Āchārya was, in addition considered, like the first Sankarāchārya, an incarnation of Siva, possessed of a genius and personality in no way inferior to those of his illustrious predecessors, so much so that he has been by later writers identified with the first Sankarāchārya himself, the greatest of the Expounders of the Advaita Philosophy and Religion. This identity in name, in title, in function, in status and in views has given room to no small confusion between the Ādi Sankarāchārya and his successors. There are innumerable works, and it is really impossible at this distant period of time to determine with certainty which of them were the handworks of Ādi Sankarāchārya, and which were written by his successors. But it is really fortunate that all scholars should uniformly agree in ascribing the Bhāṣhyās on the Prasthāna-Traya to the first Sankarāchārya or to Sankara as we shall call him hereafter. It is also a matter of great satisfaction to us to find that we have sufficient materials for determining the main incidents of his remarkable life.”

Sankara Vijayās

On the life of Sankara, we have no less than ten Sankara-Vijayas or Biographies of Sankarāchārya, purporting to have been written by the followers of his school of Philosophy; and these may be mentioned in the following order according to their probable date of composition :—

(1) The Sankara-Vijaya of Sri Chitsukhāchārya one of the direct disciples and co-students of Sankara, known under the name of Brihat Sankara-Vijaya;

(2) The Sankara-Vijaya of Anandagiri, the well-known commentator of the Bhāṣhyās and Vārtikās of Sankara and Surēśvara, known under the name of Prāchina Sankara-Vijaya;

(3) The Sankara Vijaya of Vidyāśankara or Sankarānanda, the author of Atma Pūrāṇa and of the Dīpikās on the Upaniṣhads, Bhagavadgita and Brahmasūtras, known under the name Vyāsachālīya;

(4) The Sankara-Vijaya of Govindanatha, one of the Pandits of Kērala, known under the name of Achārya Charita or Kēralīya Sankara-Vijaya ;

(5) The Sankara-Vijaya of Raja Chūdāmaṇi Dikṣhita, the author of many Sanskrit poems and dramas, known under the name of Sankarābhyudaya ;

(6) The Sankara Vijaya of Ānantānandagiri known under the name of Guru Vijaya or Achārya-Vijaya ;

(7) The Sankara-Vijaya of Vallisahayakavi, one of the adherents of the Srīngagiri Matha, known under the name of Achārya Digvijaya ;

(8) The Sankara-Vijaya of Sadānanda, also an adherent of the Srīngagiri Matha, known under the name of Sankara Digvijaya Sāra;

(9) The Sankara-Vijaya of Chidvilāsa, also an adherent of the Srīngagiri Matha, known under the name of Sankara Vijaya Vilāsa;

(10) The Sankara Vijaya of Mādhava, also an adherent of the Srīngagiri Mātha, known under the name of Samkṣhēpa Sankara.

Besides these various Sankara Vijayās, we have a number of Puṇyaśloka-Manjarīs and Guru-Paramparas preserved by the various Advaitic Maths in which we have a brief account of the chief incidents of Sankara's life recorded by his own immediate disciples. We have also a brief reference to Sankara's wonderful life recorded in an indirect manner in Gaudapadōllāsa, Harimiśriya, Patanjali-vijaya, Brihad Rājatarangini, Hayagrīvavadha, Maṇiprabha, Gururatnamālīka, Suṣhuma, Vimarśa and other works. Of these works, the last three are of invaluable interest to the historian of Sankara and the Tāmrapatrānuśāsana issued by king Sudhanvan of Dwāraka, one of the royal disciples of Sankara and published in Vimarśa by His Holiness, the present Sankarāchārya of the Dwāraka Mutha contains a brief and authentic account of the

life of Sankara. There are also hostile references to the life of Sankara in works of the Jainas, Mādhvās and Vaiṣṇavās, such as Jina-Vijaya, Mādhva-Vijaya, Mani-Manjarī etc. Though in some of the later Sankara-Vijayās and in the works of those hostile religionists above mentioned, the lives of many of the Sankarāchāryās—especially the life of Ādi Sankara of Kālati and that of Abhinava Sankara of Chidambaram—are blended together by ascribing the incidents in the life of these to one and the same person, it is still quite possible to separate and distinguish the main incidents of the life of Ādi Sankara, the admitted author of the Bhāṣhyās on the Prasthāna-Traya from those of his successors.

The following oft-quoted stanza about Ādi Sankara :

“అష్టవర్షే చతుర్వేదీ ద్వాదశే సర్వశాస్త్రవిత్ ।

షోడశే కృతవాన్ భాష్యం ద్వాత్రింశే మునిరభ్యగాత్” ॥

“अष्टवर्षे चतुर्वेदी द्वादशे सर्वशास्त्रवित् ।

षोडशे कृतवान् भाष्यं द्वात्रिंशे मुनिरभ्यगात्” ॥

“Ashtavarshē chaturvēdī dwādaśē sarvaśāstra vith
shōdaśē krutavān bhāshyam dwāthrimśe munirabhyagāth”.

Clearly shows how extraordinarily intelligent and active Sankara was throughout his life. According to this, Sankara learnt all the Vēdās by the eighth year of his age, and completed his study of the Sāstras in the house and under the guidance of his teacher before he completed his twelfth year. Between 12 and 16 years he lived with his Guru and Parama-guru and with their permission, he wrote Bhāṣhyās on 14 Upanishads. (Dasōpanishads, Nrusimhatāpani, Kaushāitaki, Svētāswatara and Maitrēyī, 10+4), Brahma Sutrās, Bhagavadgita, Sanatsujātīya. Vishṇusahasranāma Stotra, Māndukya Kārikās (By Goudapādāchārya) etc. He wrote many more Stōtrās. In his 32nd year Sri Sankara attained ‘Nirvāṇa’.

V. Śūrya Vamśi Dynasty.

(Kali 1389 to Kali 3001-1712 B. C. to 100 B. C.)

The reigns of the first 18 kings of the Śūrya vamśi dynasty are found to extend over sixty or eighty years each and if this is difficult to conceive as possible or probable for the shortlived moderns we may presume that there were actually more than 18 kings of the dynasty but only the important kings have been mentioned by name and the others were perhaps unidentified by the author of the Nēpāla Rāja Vamśāvali. But the crucial dates need not and cannot be questioned. Bhūmi-varma was crowned in Kali 1389. Vriṣha-dēva varmā's reign ended in Kali 2615 or 487 B. C., Sri Sankara visited Nēpāl in Kali 2614 or 488 B. C.

Name of the king	Years. Reigned
1. Bhūmi Varman	67
2. Chandra Varman	61
3. Jaya Varman	82
4. Varṣha Varman	61
5. Sarva Varman	78
6. Prithivi Varman	76
7. Jyēṣṭha Varman	75
8. Hari Varman	76
9. Kubēra Varma	88
10. Siddhi Varman	61
11. Haridatta Varman (built temples for the four nārāyaṇās Chainju, Ichangu, and Sikhara and temple of Jalāśayana at Buddha Nīla Kantha)	81
12. Vasudatta Varman	63
13. Pati Varman	53
14. Sivavriiddhi Varma	54
15. Vasantha Varman	61
16. Siva Varman	62
17. Rudra Varman	66
18. Vrishadēva Varman (built viharas) and erected images of Lōkēśwara and other Buddha divinities) His brother was Balārchana who was also a	61

bauddha- "Sankarāchārya" came from the south and destroyed the Buddha faith Kali 2614 or 488 - 487 B. C.)

The version of the text is correct

- | | |
|--|----|
| 19. Sankara dēva. This king was named as Sankara-dēva in memory of Adi Sankarāchārya (erected trident at Paśupati) | 25 |
| 20. Dharma dēva. son of 19 | 24 |
| 21. Mānadēva (built the Chakra vihāra near Mahirājya and according to some the Khāsa Chaitya) | 20 |
| 22. Mahīdēva. son of 21 | 20 |
| 23. Vasantha dēva. son of 22 | |
| Here is another interpolation that he was crowned in Kali 2800 or 301 B. C., which cannot be true | 15 |
| 24. Udayadēva Varman (became a Bhikṣhu) | 5 |
| 25. Mānadēva Varman | 30 |
| 26. Gunakāma dēva Varman | 10 |
| 27. Sivadēva varman (made Dēvapattana a large town and transferred the seat of Government thither. He restored the Śākta rites and became a Bhikṣhu. His son Puṇyadēva varman followed his example | 61 |
| 28. Narēndra dēva Varman (Eldest son of 27) | 42 |
| 29. Bhīmadēva Varman | 36 |
| 30. Viṣṇu dēva Varman | 47 |
| 31. Viṣṇu dēva Varman (gave his daughter to Amśuvarman of the Thākūri race. In his time Vikramāditya came to Nēpāl and established his era there) | 51 |

1612

The 31 kings of the fifth Sūrya vamśi dynasty reigned from Kali 1389 (1712 B. C.) to Kali 3001 (100 B. C.)—1612 years. Of that period the time from the first king Bhūmivarman's coronation to the coronation of the 27th king Sivadēva Varman according to the chronology of the Nēpāl Rāja Vamśāvali works out to Kali 2764. Three

inscriptions of Sivadēva Varma have been discovered (Ind. Ant. Vol. IXp. 163 ff). Of these (Nos. 12, 13, 14,) in the 12th inscription the coronation of Sivadēva Varma is dated 119th year of the Sri Harṣha era. Alberuni has recorded that the Sri Harṣha era commenced in 457 B. C. (Vide Alberuni India Vol. II, Chap, 49, pp 5 to 7, by E. C. Sachau).

Mis - representation of Dr. Buhler.

Dr. Buhler has ignored the Sri Harṣha era of 457 B. C., recorded by Alberuni on the ground that Alberuni has not given details of it or of the inauguration of the era, and hence he has identified it with the era of Sri Harṣha Silāditya of 606 A. D.

Alberuni has stated clearly that Sri Harṣha era 1488 is equivalent to 1031 A. D., and hence the inauguration of the Sri Harṣha era dates from $1488-1031 = 457$ B. C. In this matter to reduce the chronology of the Nēpāla Rāja Vamśāvali, Dr. Buhler has propagated an untruth that Alberuni has not mentioned the Sri Harṣha era definitely. Moreover he has claimed that Sri Harṣha Silāditya's era began in 606 A. D. an year in which no era was founded at all, and he has recorded the Sri Harṣha Samvat 119 of the inscription of Sivadēva-varma as equivalent to $119+606 = 725$ of the Christian era and dated the coronation of Sivadēva Varma in 725 A. D., and reduced the antiquity of the royal dynasties of Nēpāl according to the Nēpāla Rāja Vsmśāvali by 700 years. This is highly improper.

The correct dates are :-

	Kali. B. C.	
Coronation of the first king of the dynasty Bhūmivarma.	1389	1712
Coronation of the 27th king Sivadēva Varma	2764	338
Coronation of Amsuvarma of the Thākūri dynasty.	3000	101-100

If we reckon the total period of the 18 kings of this Sūrya vamśi dynasty from the first king Bhūmivarma's coro-

nation, we reach Kali 2615. Towards the end of the reign of this eighteenth king of the dynasty, according to the Nēpāla Rāja Vamśāvali, Sri (Adi) Sankarāchārya visited Nēpāl and this is exactly verified. For the period of 149 years from the 19th king to the 27th king we find in the Vamśāvali's chronology a gap of 360 years. So the proper course to adopt for a dispassionate historian is to adjust the figures for the reigns of the eight intervening kings so that the total works out to 149 years, (instead of 360 years), the interval between the visit of Sri Sankara towards the end of the reign of the 18th king in Kali 2615 and the coronation of Sivadēva Varma in Kali 2764 (or 338 B. C.) according to the inscriptions as well as the Vamśāvali.

The period of 360 years have been reduced to 149 and adjusted thus.

Name of the king.	Reigning period in the Vamśāvali.	Years Reduced.	Years Now adopted in this reconstruc- tion.
19. Sankara dēva	65	40	25 years
20. Dharmadēva	59	35	24 „
21. Māna dēva	49	29	20 „
22. Mahidēva	51	31	20 „
23. Vasantadēva	36	21	15 „
24. Udayadēva Varman	35	30	5 „
25. Mānadēva Varman	35	5	30 „
26. Guṇakāmadēva- Varman.	30	20	10 „
	360	211	149

From the date of the coronation of Sivadēva Varma the 27th king in Kali 2764 (338 B. C.) to the reign of Amśuvarma the first king of the Thākūr dynasty the periods stated in the Vamśāvali agree perfectly. Amśuvarma's reign extended from Kali 3000 (i. e. 101 B. C.) to Kali 3068 (33 B. C.). Vikramāditya's reign commenced in Kali 3020 (82 B. C.). The Vamśāvali

states that Vikramāditya visited Nēpāl and established or inaugurated his era there in Kali 3044 or 57 B.C. This is also perfectly verified. (Refer pp 64, 65, of Sri Kota Venkatāchalam's Kali Saka Vijnānam Vol. I. & Indian Eras in English. By the same author).

IV. Thākúri Dynasty.

Kali 3001-3900 ; 100 B. C. 798-799 A. D.

Name of the king.	Years Reigned
1. Amśuvarman, son-in-law of the last Suryavamśi king, crowned in Kali 3001 or 100 B. C., transferred the seat of Government to Madyalakhu; Vibhuvarman built an aqueduct with seven spouts and placed on it an inscription (No. 8) (Ind. Ant. Vol. IX, p. 171) Vikramāditya visited Nēpāl in 3044 Kali or 57 B. C., and started his era there:	68
2. Krita Varman (son of 1)	87
3. Bhimārjuna Varman son of 2	93
4. Nandadēva son of 3	25
5. Vīra dēva son of 4 was crowned in Kali 3400 or 299 A. D., founded Lalitapattana naming it after a grass-seller Lalitha, built a tank and water courses, as well as temples. Lingas etc., which were called Maṇitalās, and so forth, after the king's Ishtadēvata, Maṇiyōgini.	95
6. Chandrakētu dēva son of 5 sorely oppressed by his enemies and plunderd.	
7. Narēndradēva son of 6 built Thirtha Vihāra near Lōmri-dēvi and gave it to Bandhudatta Achārya, his spiritual guide. The first two of his three sons, Padma dēva, Ratnadēva, and Vara dēva became ascetics, while the third succeeded his father, who, before his death retired into Alāg or Ak-bahal Vihāra.	
8. Vara dēva son of 7 removed the seat of Government to Lalitha-pattana. Sankarāchārya came to	

Nēpāl. In Kali 3623 Avalokitēswara came to Nēpāl.

(years not mentioned for 6th, 7th, 8th kings)

- | | |
|--|----|
| 9. Samkara dēva | 12 |
| 10. Vardhamāna dēva son of 9, built the town of Samkhu and dedicate it to Ugratāra Dēvi | 13 |
| 11. Balidēva son of 10 | 13 |
| 12. Jayadēva son of 11 | 15 |
| 13. Balārjuna dēva | 17 |
| 14. Vikrama dēva | 12 |
| 15. Guṇakāma dēva, built Kāntipura the modern Katmāndu at the junction of the rivers Vāgmāti and Viṣhnumāti in Kali 3824 or 723 A. D., and the Village of Thambhāl, where Vikrama's old Vihāra stood, as well as many temples. | 51 |
| 16. Bhōja dēva son of 15 | 8 |
| 17. Lakṣhmi kāmādēva son of 16 | 22 |
| 18. Jayakāma dēva son of 17, as he died childless he was succeeded by a member of the Navākot Thākuri dynasty. | 20 |

551

Thus the Thākūri dynasty was founded by Amśuvarman in Kali 3000 or 101 B. C., Viradēva the 5th king of the dynasty was crowned in Kali 3400 or 299 A. D. The four kings of the dynasty that reigned before him ruled for (3400 — 3000) = 400 years.

- | | |
|-----------------|----|
| 1. Amśuvarman | 68 |
| 2. Krita varman | 87 |
| 3. Bhimārjuna | 93 |
| 4. Nandadeva | 25 |

273

The total of the periods of the four kings amounts only to 273 years. So we have to presume that besides the four kings mentioned, other kings also must have reigned during the period and having fixed the year of coronation of the 5th king Viradēva indubitably in Kali 3400, the author of the Vamśāvali must have omitted to mention the names of kings not available to him and their reigns. The Subsequent kings 6th and 7th and 8th have been named but the duration of their reigns has not been specified. In the time of the 15th king Guṇnakāmadēva, Kāntipura or modern Khatmandu was constructed, it is stated, in Kali 3829 or 728 A. D. This is an event of historical importance and the date of this specifically and unambiguously mentioned cannot be set aside. If there are gaps or discrepancies in the number of kings or in the duration of the reigns of kings, with reference to the intervals between such historically important and specifically dated events, such numbers of kings or the durations of their reigns should be adjusted to tally with the important dates but the important dates themselves cannot be questioned or tampered with. In kali 3000 the Thākúri dynasty was established on the throne of Nēpāl. Its importance lies in the change of the capital to Madhyalakhu. It is also the year in which Vibhuvāma (perhaps a brother of the king or prominent member of the Royal family) constructed an aqueduct with seven spouts in the year. It is an year of undoubted historical importance. The second important year is Kali 3824 (723 A. D.) In that year the 15th king of the Thākúri dynasty Guṇa Kāmadēva by name founded Kāntipura or modern Khatmandu and transferred the capital from Madhyalakhu to Khatmandu. These are two important dates naturally proudly remembered and correctly noted by the kings, and their descendents and carefully preserved in the records of the royal archives. These cannot be meddled with. Guṇakāma dēva ruled till 748 A. D., (Kali 3849) the interval is 3849-3000 = 849 years and together with the period of the reigns of the 16th, 17th, 18th kings (50 years) amounts to 899 years on the whole. There is nothing absurd or improbable in the fact of 18 kings of the dynasty having reigned on the whole for 899 years, nothing to cause doubt or suspicion.

On the average it works out to 50 years for a king. But if it is to be considered too much, it might be supposed that there were more kings of the dynasty but they were left out from the Vamśāvali because they were not prominent and their names were not available to the later chroniclers or the lengths of their reigns were not known. Of the 18 kings of the Thākūri dynasty, the reigns of three kings, the 6th, 7th, 8th, have not been specified. The first four kings are stated to account between themselves for 273 years. Other kings are not mentioned but some important events of their reigns in the interval between Kali 3000 to 3400 are mentioned and the reign of the 5th king is stated to commence in Kali 3400. So there is a gap of 127 years there and we have to presume two more kings to have ruled before Kali 3400. So including them the kings of the Thākūri dynasty number $18+2=20$. According to the Rāja tharangiṇi, the 100th king of Kāshmir 'was Jayāpīda' and he attacked his contemporary king of Nēpāl, who was named 'Naramudi'. He is nowhere mentioned in the Nēpāl Rāja Vamśāvali, perhaps the name has been deleted by interested meddlers with the text. So if we insert 'Naramudi' after the 8th king Varadēva, the total number of the kings will rise to 21 for a total period of their reigns of 899 years and then the average works out only to 43 years for king. The chronology of the kings of the Thākūri dynasty is given below, after the suggested adjustment. The founder of the Thākūri dynasty, the sixth of the royal dynasties of Nēpāl, was 'Amṣuvarman'. He reigned from 101 B. C. to 33 B. C. i. e. for 68 years. During his reign Nēpāl was the last kingdom to submit to the Emperor Vikramāditya. It was either conquered at the end of the triumphal programme of conquest of the Emperor, or, Amṣuvarman, without attempting to offer any resistance to the conqueror, himself invited the great king to his capital and submitted to his overlordship, and became a tributary king of his Empire. With that the conquests of Vikramāditya were completed and in token thereof during the stay of the Emperor in Nēpāl in Kali 3044 or 57 B. C. a new era named after him 'Vikrama samvat' was inaugurated according to the Nēpālārāja Vamśāvali,

1. Amśuvarman was crowned in 101 B. C. and ruled till 33 B. C.
 2. Kṛita varman ruled for 87 years till 54 A.D.
 3. Bhīmārjuna ruled for 93 years till 147 „
 4. Nandadēva ruled for 25 years till 172 „
 5. 6. The Names of the next two kings and the duration of their reigns have been omitted by the author of the Vamśāvali as the figures were not available to him or they have been deleted by interested meddlers from the text with a view to detract from the authenticity and hence the historical value of the ancient record.
They must have ruled between them for 127 years till 299 „
 7. Vīradēva was crowned in Kali 3400 or 299 A. D. and he ruled for 95 years till 394 „
 8. Chandrakētu dēva ruled from 394 for 66 years till 460 „
 9. Narēndra dēva ruled for 56 years till 516 „
 10. Varadēva ruled for 54 years till 570 „
- The 100th king of the Kāṣhmīr kings 'Jayāpīda' invaded Nēpāl at the head of a vast army. He reigned in Kāṣhmīr from 569 A. D. - 620 A.D. Then one 'Nāramudī' was the king ruling in Nēpāl. But he has not been mentioned by the author of Nēpāla Rāja Vamśāvali who mentions only the 6th, 7th, and 8th kings of the Thākūri dynasty but not the duration of their reigns. In the reign of the eighth king, 'Varadēva' Sankarāchārya (the Head of the Peetham established by Adi Sankarāchārya) visited Nēpāl in Kali 3623 or A. D. 522 according to the chronicle. So we have to place their reigns (of the 6th, 7th, 8th) kings in the interval between 3400-3623 Kali. The result will

be the same and the adjustment effected if we reduce the length of the reigns of kings or increase the number of kings. So the remaining time has been allotted to the kings mentioned and the total interval is accounted for. After 'Varadēva' the 'Naramudi' mentioned in Rājatarangiṇi as the contemporary of 'Jayāpīda' is to be placed.

11. 'Naramudi' ruled from 570 A. D., for 45 years
till 615 A.D.

This 'Naramudi' defeated and took 'Jayāpīda' prisoner in the battle but the latter escaped from prison and subsequently defeated him again and killed him.

12.	Sankara dēva	ruled for 12 years	till	627 A. D.
13.	Vardha māna dēva	ruled for 13 years	till	640 „
14.	Balidēva	„ , 13 „	„	653 „
15.	Jaya dēva	„ , 15 „	„	668 „
16.	Balārjuna	„ , 17 „	„	685 „
17.	Vikrama dēva	„ , 12 „	„	697 „
18.	Guṇakāṇa dēva	„ , 51 „	„	748 „
19.	Bhōja dēva	„ , 8 „	„	756 „
20.	Lakṣhmi kāma dēva	„ , 22 „	„	778 „
21.	Jayakāma dēva	„ , 20 „	„	798 „

On the whole for 899 years from Kali 3001-3900 or 101 B. C.— 798 A. D.

Thus adjusted, without serious divergence from the facts of history, the chronology is rendered complete and regular and intelligible. Instead of making these slight alterations and adjustments, to tamper with the Vamśāvali and render it altogether unreliable for historical purposes and then to question its authenticity, to reconstruct the entire history and chronology on the fictitious basis of their conjectures and preconceived hypotheses, to tally with other such preconceived theories of their own is not worthy of any respectable historian.

Chronology of Nēpāl Kings Reconstructed

I. Gopāla Dynasty.

(Kshatriyas, eight kings ruled 522 years).

Before Kali 1058 – 536.

From B. C. 4159 – 3637 B. C.

No.	Name of the king.	Years reigned.	Before Kali era.	B. C.
1.	Bhuktamānagata Gupta	88	1058 – 970	4159–4071
2.	Jaya Gupta	72	970 – 898	4071–3999
3.	Parama Gupta	80	898 – 818	3999–3919
4.	Harṣha Gupta	93	818 – 725	3919–3826
5.	Bhīma Gupta	38	725 – 687	3826–3788
6.	Maṇi Gupta	37	687 – 650	3788–3751
7.	Viṣṇu Gupta	42	650 – 608	3751–3709
8.	Yakṣha Gupta died child- less and brought in the Ahīr dynasty from India.	72	608 – 536	3709–3637

II, Ahir Dynasty.

(Kshatriyās, 3 kings ruled 200 years

Before Kali 536–336; 3637–3437 B. C.)

19.	Varasimha	}	536–336	3637–3437
10.	Jayamatasimha			
11.	Bhuvana simha (Reigned for 200 years. Individual reigns not given).			

III. Kirāta Dynasty. (Kshatriyās)

(29 kings ruled for 1118 years.)

(Before Kali 336–782 after Kali; from B.C. 3437–2319 B.C.)

No.	Name of the king	Years reigned.	Before kali	B. C.
12.	Yalambara			
13.	Pavi			
14.	Skandara			
15.	Valamba			
16.	Hriti			

17. Humati went to the forest with the Pāṇḍavās	}	Kali 336-36 ;	B. C. 3437-3137.
18. Jitēdāsti assisted the Pāṇḍavās in the Great war and was killed.			
These seven kings reigned for 300 years.			

19. Gali (Crowned in Before Kali 36 ;
3138—3137 B. C.).

20. Puṣhka
21. Suyarma
22. Parbha
23. Thunka
24. Svananda
25. Stunco
26. Gighri
27. Nāne
28. Lūk
29. Thor
30. Thóko
31. Varma
12. Gúja
13. Puṣhkara
14. Kēsu
15. Sunsa
16. Sammu
17. Guṇana
18. Kimbu
19. Patuka
40. Gasti

These twenty-two kings from 19
to 40 reigned for 782 years in Kali
and 36 years before Kali, total 818
years.

Before Kali 36 to
782 Kali ;
or
3137 B.C. - 2319 B.C.

Sômvamśi Dynāsty.

(12 kings reigned 607 Yrs.)

From Kali 782 – 1389

From B. C. 2319 – 1712 B. C.

Kali. B. C.

41. Nimiṣha

42. Mānākṣha

43. Kākavārman

44 to 48 Names not given

49. Paśuprēkṣha dēva. He brought settlers
from Hindustan in Kaliyuga 1234 or
1867 B. C.

782–1246

2139–1855

(These nine kings reigned for 464
years. (41 to 49).

50 and 51. Kings names not known.

52. Bhāskaravarman

(These three kings ruled for 143 years)

Bhāskaravarman conquered the whole Kali 1246 1389
of India. Being childless he adopted the or
first ruler of the Sūryavamśi dynasty B. C. 1855 1712
Bhūmivarman who was crowned king in
1389 Kali, or 1712 B. C.

V. Sūryavamśi Dynāsty.

(31 kings reigned for a period of 1612 years).

Kali. 1389 to 3001

B. C. 1712 to 100.

	Years	Kali	B. C.
53. Bhūmivarman	67	1389 1456	1712 1645
54. Chandravarman	61	1456 1517	1645 1584
55. Jayavarman	82	1517 1599	1584 1502
56. Varṣhavarman	61	1599 1660	1502 1441
57. Sarvavarman	78	1660 1738	1441 1363
58. Prithvivarman	76	1738 1814	1363 1287
59. Jyēsthavarman	75	1814 1889	1287 1212

	Years	Kali		B. C.	
60. Hari Varman	76	1839	1965	1212	1133
61. Kubēra Varman	88	1965	2053	1136	1048
62. Siddhi Varman	61	2053	2114	1048	987
63. Haridatta Varman	81	2114	2195	987	906
64. Vasudatta Varman	63	2195	2258	906	843
65. Pati Varman	53	2258	2311	843	790
66. Sivavridddhi Varman	54	2311	2365	790	736
67. Vasanta Varman	61	2365	2426	736	675
68. Siva Varman	62	2426	2489	675	613
69. Rudra Varman	66	2488	2554	613	547
70. Vrishadēva Varman	61	2554	2615	547	486
Ādi Sankarācharya came from the South and destroyed the Buddha faith. Kali 2614 or 487, B. C. (named his son after Sankara).					
71. Sankaradēva	25	2615	2640	486	461
72. Dharmadēva	24	2640	2664	461	437
73. Mānadēva	20	2664	2684	437	417
74. Mahidēva	20	2684	2704	417	397
75. Vasantadeva	15	2704	2719	397	382
76. Udayadēva Varman	5	2719	2724	382	377
77. Mānadēva Varman	30	2724	2754	377	347
78. Guṇakāmadēva Varman	10	2754	2764	347	337
79. Sivadēva Varman	61	2764	2825	337	276
(crowned in 2764 Kali or 338-337 B. C.)					
80. Narēndra dēva Varman	42	2825	2867	276	234
81. Bhimadēva Varman	36	2867	2903	234	198
82. Viṣṇudēva Varman	47	2903	2950	198	151
83. Viśwadēva Varman	51	2950	3001	151	101-100

He had no sons and gave his daughter to Amśuvarman of the Thākūri dynasty; in his time Vikramāditya came to Nēpāl and established his era there.

VI. Thākūri Dynasty. (21 Kings reigned for 899 years.)

From Kali 3000 – 3899.

B. C. 101 – 100 – 798 A. D.

		Kali		B. C.	
84. Amsuvarman	68	3001	3069	101	33
Vikramāditya of Ujjain visited Nepāl in 3044 Kali or 57 B: C. and inaugurated his era there.					
				A. D.	
85. Kritavarman	87	3069	3156	33	54
86. Bhimārjuna	93	3156	3249	54	147
87. Nandadēva	25	3249	3274	147	172
88. Names of these two kings					
89. not given in the	60	3274	3334	172	232
Vamśāvali	66	3334	3400	232	298-99
90. Viradēva (He was crowned king in Kali 3400 or 299 A. D.)	95	3400	3495	299	394
91. Chandrakētu dēva	36	3495	3561	394	460
92. Narēndradēva	56	3561	3617	460	516
93. Varadēva (In 3623 Kali or 522 A.D. Sankarāchārya and Avalokithēswara came to Nēpāl)	54	3617	3671	516	570
94. Naramudi	45	3671	3716	570	615
95. Sankaradēva	12	3716	3728	615	627
96. Vardhamānadēva	13	3728	3741	627	640
97. Balidēva	13	3741	3754	640	653
98. Jayadēva	15	3754	3769	653	668
99. Balārjuna deva	17	3769	3786	668	688
100. Vikramadēva	12	3786	3788	688	697
101. Guṇakāma deva	51	3798	3849	697	748
102. Bhójadēva	8	3849	3857	748	756
103. Lakṣhmi kāmādēva	22	3858	3779	756	778
104. Jayakāma dēva	20	3879	3899	778	798

The 104 kings reigned from B. K. 1058 to Kali 3899 or 4159 B. C. to 798 A. D. i. e. a period of 4957 years. Thus Nēpāl has its history from before Kali 1058 or 4159 B. C.

(i. e. B. K. 1058 + A. K. 5054 = 6112 years' History till now)

(or 4159 B. C. + 1958 A. D. = 6117 years' History till now)

VII. Navākót Thākūri Dynasty

1. Bhāskaradēva
2. Baladēva son of 1.
3. Padmadēva son of 2.
4. Nāgārjunadēva son of 3
5. Sankaradēva son of 4. (in his reign a widowed Brahmani 'Kaphi' in Ganda, who lived in the village of Jhal in Nēpāl, caused a M. S. Prajna Paramita (Book) to be written with golden letters in Samvat 245. After his death, Vāmadēva a collateral descendant of Amśuvarman's family, assisted by chiefs in Lalitapattana and Kāntipura, expelled the Navākót Thākūris and drove them back to their original seat. With him begins :- The second Thākūri Dynasty of Amśuvarman.

VIII. The second Thākūri Dynasty of Amśuvarman. (720 A. D. to 945 A.D.)

1. Vāmadēva.
2. Harṣhadēva son of 1.
3. Śadaśivadēva son of 2 built Kirtipura on a hill southwest of Katmāndu and a golden roof for Paśupati's temple in Kaliyuga 3851 or 750 A. D.

He introduced coins of copper alloyed with iron, marked with the figure of a lion.

- | | |
|---|----|
| 4. Mānadēva son of 3 became an ascetic in the Chakravihāra. | 10 |
| 5. Narasimhadēva son of 4 | 22 |
| 6. Nandadēva son of 5. | 21 |
| 7. Rudradēva son of 6 (became a Buddhist monk) | 19 |
| 8. Mitradēva son of 7. | 21 |
| 9. Aridēva son of 8. | 22 |

As a son was born to him while he was engaged in wrestling, he gave to the child the biruda of Malla or the wrestler.

10. Abhayāmalla son of 9.

11. Jayadēvamalla son of 10 established, with the help of Sakhwal the Nevāri era beginning 880 A. D. 10

He ruled over Kāntipura and Lalitapattana, while his younger brother,

12. Ānandamalla, founded Bhaktapura or Bhātagām and the seven towns, Vēnipura, Pānāti, Nala, Dhōmakhel, Khadpu or Shadpu, Chankāt, and Sanga, and resided in Bhātgam. 25

During the reign of these two brothers came from the South the founder of the IXth Karnātaka Dynasty.

IX. Karnātaka Dynasty. (890 A. D. to 1110 A.D.)

1. Nanyadēva conquered the whole country on Srāvaṇa Sudi 7 of Nepālasamvat 9 or Sakasamvat 811 i. e. 890 A. D., and drove the two Mallas to Tirhut. He ruled at Bhātgam during 50 years. 50

2. Gangadēva son of 1. 41

3. Narasimhadēva son of 2. 31

In his reign on Phālguna Sudi 6 of Nepālasamvat 111 or 999 A. D., king Malla-dēva and Kātyamalla of Lalitapattana founded Chāpagām or Champāpuri. 39

4. Saktidēva son of 3 39

5. Rāmasimhadēva son of 4 58

6. Haridēva son of 5 transferred his capital to Kātmāndu. The army of Pattana (Lalitapattana) rose in rebellion and drove Harideva to Thambal.

A magār (Low caste servant) was dismissed from king Harideva's service, and in revenge drew king Mukundasēna into the country, which was conquered by him. His soldiers destroyed the sacred images and

took the Bhaīrava from the temple of Matōyēndra-vadhā away to Pālpa. In consequence of Paśupati's anger, Mukundasēna's whole army died of cholera. Mukundasēna alone escaped in the guise of an ascetic, and died on the Dēvighāt.

As Nepāl had been completely devastated an inter-regnum of seven or eight years followed.

The bais Thākūris of Navākōt came back to occupy the country. In Lalitapattana every tol or ward had its own king, and in Kāntipura twelve kings ruled at once.

Bhātgam too, was held by a Thākūri king. The Thākūris ruled the country during 225 years and built many Buddha temples and Vihārās. Then king Harisimhadēva of the Solar dynasty was driven by the Mussalmans from Ayodhya; and established himself at Simrongadha in the Terai. At the command of his guardian deity, Tulja Bhavāni, he entered Nēpāl and founded :— X. The Śūryavamśi Dynasty of Bhātgam.

X. The Śūryavamśi Dynasty of Bhātgam.

(1324 A. D. to 1410 A. D.)

1. Harisimhadēva, conquered the valley in Sakasamvat 1245 or Nepāl Samvat 444 (i. e. 1324 A. D.)
2. Matisimhadēva son of 1 15
3. Saktisimhadēva son of 2 received a letter from the emperor of China with a seal bearing the inscription Saktisimharāma in the Chinese year 535 and abdicated the throne. 33
4. Syāmasimhadēva son of 3. In his reign a fearful earthquake happened on Bhādrapada Sudi 12 of Nepāl Samvat 528 or 1408 A. D. His daughter was married to a descendent of the Mallas who held Tirhut before Nanyadēva. Thus after the king's death arose, 15'

XI. The Third Thākuri Dynasty.

(1410 A. D. to 1538 A. D.)

	Years Reigned
1. Jayabhadramalla	15
2. Nāgamalla son of 1	15
3. Jayajagatmalla son of 2	11
4. Nāgēndramalla son of 3	10
5. Ugramalla son of 4	15
6. Aśōkamalla son of 5 drove the Bais Thākuris out of Pātāna, and founded near Svayambhunādha the town of Kāssīpura between the rivers Mānmati and Vāgmāti and Rudramati.	19
7. Jayastitimalla son of 6 made laws for castes and families, dedicated many images and built temples. An inscription of his, dated Nēpāla samvat 512 is found on a stone near Lalitapattana. He died on Kārtika badi 5 of Nēpāla samvat 549 or 1429 A. D.	43
8. Yakṣhamalla son of 7 built the walls of Bhātgam where to the right of the principal gate an inscription is put up dated Srāvana Sudi of Nēpālasamvat 573 or 1453 A. D. He and his successor built a temple of Dattātrēya in the Tāchapātol of Bhātgam. He died in Nēpālasamvat 592 or 1472 A. D., and left 3 sons, the eldest and the youngest of whom founded two separate dynasties at Bhātgam and Kātmāndu while the second Raṇamalla held the town Bānēpa.	43

XI. (a) Bhātgam Line.

(1472 A. D. to 1720 A. D.)

9. Jayarāyamalla eldest son of 8	15
10. Suvarṇamalla son of 9	15
11. Prāṇamalla son of 10	15
12. Viśwamalla son of 11	15
13. Trīlōkyamalla son of 12	15

XI. (b) Kātmandu Line	85
14. Jagajjyòtirmalla or Jayajjòtirmalla son of 13	15
15. Narèndramalla son of 14	21
16. Jagatprakāṣamalla son of 15	21
In his time Harasimha Bhārō and Vasimha Bhāro built a temple of Bhīmasèna, inscribing the date N. S. 775, or 1655 A. D., on a stone lion. On Mārgaśīrṣha Sudi 6 of N. S. 782 or 1662 A. D., the king incised five Hymns in honour of Bhavāni.	
17. Jitamitramalla son of 16	21
18. Bhūpatindramalla son of 17	34
19. Ranjitamalla son of 18. In his time the Ghorka Rāja Narabhūpāla Sha invaded Nēpāl and with him the dynasty became extinct.	

XI. (b) Kātmāndu Line.

(1472 A. D. to 1768 A. D.)

1. Ratnamalla youngest son of 8	11
slew 12 Thākūri Rājās of Kāntipura defeated in N. S. 611 or 1491 A. D., the Thākūris of Navākōt and latter the Bhōtiyās (Tibetans) with the help of Siva king of Pālpa.	
In his reign the Mussal-mans first attacked the country. Sōmasèkhara nanda a southern Brāhmaṇa became High Priest of Paśupati, a temple of Tulajādēvi was dedicated in N. S. 621 or 1501 A. D., and a new copper currency with a lion was introduced.	
2. Amaramalla son of 1 ruled over 28 towns and villages.	47
In his reign a great temple on the model of that at Gaya was built at Lalita Pattāṇa.	
3. Sūryamalla son of 2	
4. Narèndramalla son of 3	
5. Mahindramalla son of 4 received from the emperor of Delhi permission to issue silver coins, became a friend of Trilōkyamalla of Bhātgam, dedicated a temple to Tul.	

jādēvi in Kātmndu on Māgha Sudi 5 of N.S. 669. In his reign Pūrāndara Rājavamśi built a tēmples of Nārāyaṇa, close to the palace in Lalitapattana, N. S. 686 or 1566 A. D.

6. Sadāsivamalla, son of 5 was compelled by his subjects to fly to Bhātgam where he was imprisoned.
7. Sivasimhamalla, younger brother of 6, according to an inscription repaired the temple of Svayambhu in N. S. 714, or 1594 A. D., while his queen Ganga restored the temple of Changu Nārāyaṇa in N. S. 705 or 1585 A. D. He had two sons, the elder of whom ruled over Kāntipura, while the younger obtained Lalitapattana already during the life-time of his father.
8. Lakshminārāsīmhamalla elder son of 7. During his reign in N. S. 715 or 1595 A. D., the modern temple of Gōrakhnāth, called Katmandu, was built, after which the town of Kāntipūra was called Kātmāndu. He became insane, was dethroned by his son and kept in confinement during 16 years.
9. Pratāpamalla son of 8 ruled from N.S. 759 or 1639 A.D. He was a poet. The inscriptions of his reign are four, the last is in N. S. 777, or 1657 A.D. He had four sons, Pārthivēndra, Nripēndra, Mahipatindra, Chakrapatindra. 1, 2, died shortly. 3rd son of 9
10. Mahipatindramalla died N. S. 814 or 1694 A. D.
11. Bhāskaramalla son of 10 ruled until N. S. 822 (or 1702 A. D.) died childless when aged 22 years.
12. Jagajjayamalla a distant relative was placed on the throne by the wives of 11. He had five sons. He died in N. S. 852 or 1732 A. D.
13. Jayaprakāśa 2nd son of 12. He was deposed in N. S. 888 or 1768 A. D., by the Ghōrka king Prithvinārāyaṇa.

XI. (c) Lalitapattana Line.

(1594 A. D. to 1768 A. D.)

1. Hariharasimha, younger son of Sivasimha of Kāntipura or (Kātmāṇḍu).
2. Siddhinrisimha son of 1 became an ascetic in N. S. 777 or 1657 A. D.
3. Srinivāsa malla son of 2 reigned from N. S. 777 or 1657 A. D., had a war with Pratāpamalla of Kātmāṇḍu N. S. 778 or 1658 – 1662. His latest inscription dated N. S. 821 or 1701 A. D.
4. Yōganarēndramalla lost his son and became an ascetic. (son of 3).
5. Mahipatindra or Mahindramalla of Kātmāṇḍu became king died N. S. 842 or 1722 A. D.
6. Jayayōgaprākāśa found an inscription bearing 1723 A. D.
7. Viṣṇumalla son of Yōganarēndra's fourth daughter died without issue shortly after 1737 A. D.
8. Rajyaprakāśa 3rd son of 12 of Kāntipura appointed as king by 7 made blind by the Pradhānās and expelled after one year.
9. Not known
10. Jayaprakāśa king of Kāntipūr 2 years
11. Viśwajit-malla, murdered.
12. Dalamardana Shah. of Navakōt 4 years
13. Tējanārāyaṇa simha a descendent of Viśwajit Malla (No. 11). 3 years
then the country was conquered by the Ghōrka King Prithvi Nārāyaṇa. (1768 A. D.)

APPENDIX I

Statement showing the contemporaneity of Kings with their reigning periods in 3 of the states of Bharat namely 1. Magadha, 2. Nepal, 3. Kashmir.

KALI. I = 3101 B.C.

S. Before Kali No. From-To	<i>Magadha.</i>		<i>Nepal.</i>		<i>Kashmir.</i>	
	<i>Barhadradha Dynasty</i> (Capital Kurukshetra)		<i>Gopala Dynasty.</i>		<i>Gonanda Dynasty.</i>	
	Name of the King		Years reigned.	Reigned Till B.K.	Reigned Till B.K.	History of the time is not traced.
1. 1058 970	Last but one king in Kuru family name not known.	88	1. Bhuktamāna gatha gupta. 1058 to 970			88
2. 970 893	Last king of Kuru family name not known.	72	2. Jaya Gupta	898		"
3. 898 818	Sudhanva I	80	3. Parama Gupta	818		"
4. 818 725	Suhōtra	93	4. Harsha Gupta	725		"
5. 725 687	Chyavana	38	5. Bhima Gupta	687		"
6. 687 650	Krimi or Kriti	37	6. Maṇi Gupta	650		"
7. 650 608	Chaidya or Uparichara Vasu or Pratipa	42	7. Viṣṇu Gupta	608		"
8. 608 536	Brihadradha I. Founder of the Magadha kingdom, with 'Girivraja' as capital	72	8. Yaksha Gupta	536		"
9. 536 466	Kuśāgra	70	Ahir Dynasty			
			9. 1st king, name not known	466		"

<i>Magadha,</i>			<i>Nepal,</i>		<i>Kashmir,</i>	
<i>Barhadradha Dynasty</i>			<i>Kirata Dynasty.</i>		<i>Gonanda Dynasty.</i>	
(Capital Girivraja)			Years		Reigned	
Name of the King			reigned		Till B.K.	
S. Before Kali	No. From-To					Reigned Till B. K.
10.	466 396	Riṣabhā	70	10.	2nd king name not known	396
11.	396 336	Satyahita	60	11.	3rd king name not known	336
				Kirata Dynasty		
				Gonanda Dynasty		
				B. K. 348.136		
12.	336 293	Punya or Puṣpavanta	43	12.	Yalambara	293
13.	293 250	Satyadhruti	43	13.	Pavi	250
14.	250 207	Sudhanva II.	43	14.	Skandara	207
15.	207 164	Sarva	43	15.	Valamba	164
16.	164 121	Bhuvana or Sambhava	43	16.	Hriti	121
17.	121 79	Jarāsandha or Brihadradha II	42	17.	Humati	79
18.	79 37	Sahadēva (died in the Mahā- bhārata War of 3138 B. C. or B. K. 36)	42	18.	Jitēdāsti (died in the Mahābhārata War of 3138 B.C. or B. K.	36
				Counting from :— Gōnanda 1. (B. K. 136 to 86)		86
				2. Dāmodara 1		38

S. Kali years		<i>Magadha,</i> <i>Pradyota Dynasty</i> (Capital Girivraja)		<i>Nepal,</i> <i>Somavamsi Dynasty.</i>		<i>Kashmir,</i> <i>Gonanda Dynasty.</i>	
No.	From—To	Name of the King	Years reigned	Reigned Till B.K.	Reigned Till B.K.		
22.	122 162	Nirāmitra	40	23. Thunka	149	—	—
23.	162 220	Sukrutha or Sukṣhatra	58	24. Swānanda	187	—	—
				25. Stunko	220	—	—
24.	220 243	Brihatkarma	23	26. Gighri	258	—	—
25.	243 293	Syēnajit	50	27. Nāne	293	—	—
26.	293 333	Srutanjaya	40	28. Lūk	333	—	—
27.	333 368	Mahābala	35	29. Thōr	368	—	—
28.	368 426	Suchi	58	30. Thoko	412	—	—
29.	426 454	Kṣhēmya	28	31. Varma	449	—	—
30.	454 518	Anuvrata	64	32. Gūja	486	—	—
				33. Puṣhkara	523	—	—
31.	518 553	Dharmanētra	35	34. Kēsū	560	—	—
32.	553 611	Nirvriti	58	35. Sunsa	597	—	—
33.	611 649	Suvrata	38	36. Sammu	634	—	—
34.	649 707	Drudhasēna or Mahāsēna	58	37. Guṇana	671	—	—
				38. Kimbu	708	—	—
35.	707 740	Sumati or Mahānētra	33	39. Patuka	745	—	—
36.	740 762	Suchala or Subala	22	40. Gasti	782	—	—
Somavamsi Dynasty							
37.	762 802	Sunētra	40	41. Nimisha	835	—	—
38.	802 885	Satyajit	83	42. Mānākṣha	888	—	—
39.	885 920	Virajit	35	43. Kāka-Varman	940	—	—
40.	920 970	Ripunjaya	50				

Pradyota Dynasty

41.	970	993	Pradyōta
42.	993	1017	Pālaka
43.	1017	1067	Viśākhayūpa
44.	1067	1088	Janaka
45.	1088	1108	Nandivardhana
Śiśunāga Dynasty.			
46.	1108	1148	Śiśunāga
47.	1148	1184	Kākavarma
48.	1184	1210	Kṣhēmadharma
49.	1210	1250	Kṣhēmajit
50.	1250	1288	Vidhisāra or Bimbisāra
51.	1288	1315	Ajātaśatru
52.	1315	1350	Darsaka

53. 1350 1383 Udayana

54. 1383 1425 Nandivardhana

55. 1425 1468 Mahānandi

Nanda Dynaŝty.

56.	1468	1556	Mahāpadma Nanda
57.	1556	1568	Sons of "

44. Name not known 992

45. " 1044

46. " 1096

47. " 1148

48. " 1200

49. Pasuprēkshadēva 1252

50. Name not known 1298

51. " 1344

52. Bhāskaravarman 1389

(reigned till 1389

Kali, being chai-

ld-less he adop-

ted Bhūmi Var-

man.)

Sūryavamsi Dynaŝty.

53. Bhūmi varman 1456

41. Kuṣa or

Kusāsaya 1428

42. Khagendra 1467

43. Surēndra 1506

44. Gōdhara 1545

45. Suvarṇa 1584

Magadha

Maurya Dynasty (Capital Girivraja)

S. Kali years
No. From—To

Name of the King

Maurya Dynasty.

58. 1568 1602 Chandragupta
59. 1602 1630 Bindusāra
60. 1630 1666 Aśoka Maurya
61. 1666 1674 Supārśva or Suyāsa
62. 1674 1682 Dasaradha

63. 1682 1752 Indrapālita

64. 1752 1760 Harṣhavardhana
65. 1760 1769 Sangata
66. 1769 1782 Sālīsūka
67. 1782 1789 Somaśarna
68. 1789 1797 Satadhanva

69. 1797 1884 Brihadradha

Sunga Dynasty.

70. 1884 1944 Puṣyamitra Sunga
71. 1944 1994 Agnimitra
72. 1994 2050 Vasumitra
73. 2050 2047 Sujyēṣṭha

Nepal

Suryavamsi Dynasty

Years
reigned

Reigned
Till Kali

Regined
Till Kali

- 34
56. Varshavarman 1660
- 36
- 8
57. Sarvavarman 1738
- 8
- 70

46. Janaka 1623
47. Sachinara 1654
- "
- "
48. Aśoka or Dharma Aśoka 1702
49. Jalauka 1758

Kashmir

Gonanda Dynasty

58. Prithivivarman 1814
50. Dāmòdara II 1808
59. Jyēṣṭhavarman 1889
51. Kāniṣhka 1868
60. Harivarman 1965
52. Abhimanyu 1920
53. Gónanda III 1955
61. Kubēravarman 2053
54. Vibhishana 2009½
55. Indrajit 2045

74.	2047	2077	Bhadraka or Andhraka	30	62.	Siddivarman	2114	56.	Rāvana	2075
75.	2077	2110	Pulindaka	33	57.			57.	Vibhiṣhaṇa	2110½
76.	2110	2113	Ghoshāvasu	3						
77.	2113	2142	Vajramitra	29	63.	Haridattavarman	2195	58.	Kinnara or	
78.	2142	2174	Bhāgavata	32					Nara	2150
79.	2174	2184	Dēva Bhūti	10	59.	Siddha		59.	Siddha	2210
			Kāṇva Dynasty.							
80.	2184	2223	Vasudēva Kāṇva	39						
81.	2223	2247	Bhūmi Mitra	24	64.	Vasudattavarman	2258	60.	Utpalakṣha	2240½
82.	2247	2259	Nārāyaṇa Kāṇva	12						
83.	2259	2269	Suśarma	10						
			Āndhra Dynasty.							
84.	2269	2292	Srīmukha	23	65.	Pativarman	2311	61.	Hiranyakṣha	2278
85.	2292	2310	Srīkrishna Sātakarni	18						
86.	2310	2320	Sri Malla Sātakarni	10	66.	Siva Vridhi- varman	2365	62.	Hiranyakula	2398
87.	2320	2338	Pūrṇotaṅga	18						
88.	2338	2394	Sri Sātakarni	56	67.	Vasantavarman	2426	63.	Vasukula	2398
89.	2394	2412	Skandastanbin	18						
90.	2412	2430	Lambōdara	18						
91.	2430	2442	Apitaka	12						
92.	2442	2460	Mēghaswāti	18	68.	Sivavarman	2488	64.	Mihira Kula	2468
93.	2460	2478	Sātaswāti	18						
94.	2478	2485	Skanda Sātakarni	7						
95.	2485	2488	Mrugendra Sātakarni	3						

*Magadha,
Andhra Dynasty
(Capital Girivraja)*

*Nepal,
Thakur Dynasty.*

*Kashmir,
Gonanda Dynasty.*

S. Kali years No. From—To	Name of the King	Years reigned	Reigned Till Kali	Reigne(Till Kali
96.	2488 2496 Kuntala Sātākarni	8		
97.	2496 2508 Saumya Sātākarni	2	69. Rudravarman	2554
98.	2503 2509 Sāta Sātākarni	1		65. Baka
99.	2509 2545 Pulōma Sātākarni	36		66. Kshīṇandana
100.	2545 2583 Mēgha Sātākarni	38		2598.
101.	2583 2608 Ariṣhta Sātākarni	25		
102.	2608 2613 Hāla	5	70. Vriṣhadēva- varman	2615
103.	2613 2618 Maṇḍalaka	5		67. Vasunandana
104.	2618 2639 Puriendrāsēna	21		2635
105.	2639 2640 Sundara Sātākarni	1	71. Sankaradēva	2640
106.	2640 2640½ Chakōra Sātākarni	½		
106a.	2640½ 2641 Mahēndrasātākarni	½	72. Dharmānētra	2664
107.	2641 2669 Siva Sātākarni	28	73. Manadēva	2684
108.	2669 2694 Gautamiputra Śrī Sātākarni	25		
109.	2694 2726 Pulomān II	32	74. Mahidēva	2704
110.	2726 2733 Sivaśrī Sātākarni	7	75. Vasantadēva	2719
111.	2733 2740 Sivaskanda Sātākarni	7	76. Udayadēva- varman	2724
112.	2740 2759 Yagnaśrī Sātākarni	19	77. Mānadēva- varman	2751
113.	2759 2765 Vijayaśrī Sātākarni	6		
114.	2765 2768 Chandraśrī Sātākarni	3	78. Guṇakāma- devavarman	2764
115.	2768 2775 Pulomān III	7		
			71. Gōkaṇa	2780

Gupta Dynasty

Capital: Pataliputra

116.	2775	2782	Chandragupta	7	79.	Sivadēva- varman	2825	72	Kinkhila or Narēndrāditya	2817
117.	2782	2833	Samudragupta	51	80.	Narēndradēva varman	2867	73.	Andha Yudhṣhṭira	2830
118.	2833	2869	Chandragupta II	36	81.	Bhimadēva varman	2903	74.	Pratāpāditya	2862
119.	2869	2911	Kumārāgupta	42	82.	Viṣṇudēva varman	2950	75.	Jalaukasa Tunjina	2894
120.	2911	2936	Skandāgupta	25	83.	Viśwadēva varman	3001	76.	Vijāya	2930
121.	2936	2976	Narasimhagupta	40				77.	Jayendra	2938
122.	2976	3020	Kumārāgupta II	44				78.	Sandhimati	2975
								79.		3022

Panwar Dynasty

Capital Ujjain

From 3020 Kali the Pānwār dynasty came into prominence. Vikramāditya, king of Ujjain, the 8th sovereign in the Pānwār line of kings became emperor of the whole of Bhāratavarṣha from the Himālayas to capecomorin. He was crowned in 3020 Kali and reigned the empire till 3120 Kali having Ujjain as his capital. He incorporated the Magadha Kingdom and Pataliputra in his empire.

S. Kali years No. From—To	<i>Magadha</i>		Years reigned	<i>Nepal</i>		Years reigned	<i>Kashmir</i>	
	<i>Maurya Dynasty</i> (Capital Girtivraja) 王都 紀提婆	Name of the King		<i>Suryavamsi Dynasty</i>			<i>Gonanda Dynasty</i>	
123. 3020 3120	VIKRAMADITYA	100		Thakur Dynasty				
				84. Amṣuvarman 3069	Reigned Till Kali	80. Mēghavāhana 3056		
				(Emperor Vikramāditya of Ujjain came to Nēpāl and established his era there in 3044 Kali or 58-57 B. C.)				
				85. Kritavarman 3156			Pravarasena or Tunjina 3086	
							Hiranya 3116	
124. 3120 3130	Dēvabhakta	10						
125. 3130 3179	Son of " (Name not known)	49		86. Bhimārjuna 3249			Mātrugupta 3121	
126. 3179 3239	SALIVAHANA	60					(Sent by Empē- ror Vikramā- ditya of Ujjain as king of kāsh- mir.)	
							Pravarasēna II 3181	
							Yudhishṭira II 3200	
							Lakshmaṇa or Narēndrā- ditya 3233	

127.	3339 • 3295	Sālihotra	56	87.	Narēndradēva	3274	87.	Tunjina or Ranāditya	3275
128.	3295	Sālivardhana	56	88.	Name not given	3334	88.	Vikramāditya	3317
129.	3351	Suhōtra	56	89.	Name not given	3400	89.	Baladitya	3354
130.	3407			90.	Viradēva	3495	90.	Durlabha- vardhana	3390
131.	3463	Havirhōtra	56	91.	Chandrakētu		91.	Durlabha or Pratāpaditya	3440
132.	3519	Indrapāla	55	92.	Dēva	3561	92.	Chandrāpida or Varnāditya	3499
	3574	Mālyavān					93.	Tārāpida	3533
							94.	Lalitāditya	3569
133.	3574	Sambhudatta	55	92.	Narēdrādēva	3617	95.	Kuvalayāditya	3570
134.	3629	Bhaumarāja	55	93.	Varadēva	3671	96.	Vajrāditya	3627
				94.	Naramudi	3716	97.	Prithivyāpida	3671
135.	3684	Vatsarāja	55	95.	Sankaradēva	3728	98.	Sangrāmāpida	3671
				96.	Vardhamāna- dēva	3741	99.	Jayāpida	3722
136.	3739	BHOJARAJA	56	97.	Balidēva	3754	100.	Lalitāpida	3774
				98.	Jayādēva	3769			
				99.	Baḥṛjanadēva	3786			
				100.	Vikramādēva	3798			
137.	3795	Sambhudatta II	43	101.	Gunakamadēva	3849	101.	Sngrāmāpida II	3831
				102.	Bhōjadēva	3857	102.	Chipyata	
138.	3838	Bindupāla	43	103.	Lakṣmi- kamadeva	3879		Jayāpida	3833

S. Before Kali No. From-To	<i>Magadha,</i> <i>Barhadrachha Dynasty</i> (Capital Girivraja)	Name of the King	Years reigned	<i>Nepal,</i> <i>Somavamsi Dynasty.</i>	<i>Kashmir,</i> <i>Gonanda Dynasty.</i>
139. 3881 3924	Rājapāla		43	Reigned Till B.K. 3999	Reigned Till B.K. 3999
		104. Jayakāmadeva 3999 These 104 kings reigned from 1058 B.K. to 3899 Kali or 4159 B.C. to 798 A. D. i. e. a Period of 4957 years. After 798 A.D, we have got the history upto 1768 A D. when Nēpāl came under the rule of Ghōrka king Prithvina- rayana'. From 1768 A.D to 1953 A.D., we can have the modern history of Nēpāl. (i.e. we have tra- ced the History of Nēpāl from 4159 B.C. to a pe- riod of 6112 yrs)			103. Ajitāpida

140.	3924	3967	Mahinara	43	104. Anangāpida 3942 105. Utpalāpida 3947 106. Sukhavarma 3954
141.	3967	4010	Sōmavarma	43	107. Avantivarma 3982 108. Sankaravarma 4002 109. Gopālavarma 4004 110. Sankata 111. Sugandha 4006 112. Sūravarma
142.	4010	4053	Kāmavarma	43	113. Pārtha 4020 114. Nirjitavarma 4022 115. Chakravarma 4036 116. Unmattāvanti 4038 117. Yaśaskara 4047½ 118. Varnāta 119. Sangrāma- dēva 4048
143.	4053	4095	Bhūmipāla or Veerasimha	42	120. Parvagupta 4050 121. Kṣhēmagupta 4059 122. Abhimanyu gupta 4073 123. Nandigupta 4074 124. Tribhuvana- gupta 4076 125. Bhimagupta 4081 126. Dittā or Didda 4114

144.	4095	4161	Rangapāla	66	127. Sangrāmārāja	4129
					128. Harirāja	4149
					129. Ananta Deva	
145.	4161	4228	Kalpasimha	67	130. Kalāṣa	4200
					131. Utkarṣha	4212
					132. Harṣha	4222
					133. Uchhala	4230
					134. Sankharāja	
					135. Sussala	
146.	4228	4295	Gangā Simha	67	136. Jayasimha	4250
	or	1198	A. D.)		or A. D. 1148	

The history of Kashmir from 1148 A. D. to 1245 A. D., and that of the Kings is not known to us. From 1195 A. D. to 1324-25 A. D. Kashmir was ruled by Simha Dēva. Afterwards it was occupied by Muslims. We can have the details of the later history in our 'Chronology of Kashmir History Reconstructed'.

This Dynasty came to an end in the 2nd battle of Kurukṣetra or Thānēsvar which was fought with Gōri Muhammad.

APPENDIX II

Imperial Royal Dynasties of Bharat.

(After the Mahābhārata War)

From 36 years before Kali or 3138 B. C. to 4295 Kali or 1193 A. D.

Magadha Empire

S. No.	Name of the Dynasty.	No. of kings No. of years reigned reigned	Kali	B. C.
--------	----------------------	--	------	-------

1.	Barhadradha Dynasty	22	1006	
----	---------------------	----	------	--

2.	Pradyōta	5	138	3138-2132
----	----------	---	-----	-----------

3.	Sisunāga	10	360	2132-1994
----	----------	----	-----	-----------

4.	Nanda	2	100	1994-1634
----	-------	---	-----	-----------

5.	Maurya	12	316	1634-1534
----	--------	----	-----	-----------

6.	Sunga	10	300	1534-1218
----	-------	----	-----	-----------

7.	Kānwa	4	85	1218- 918
----	-------	---	----	-----------

8.	Andhra	32	506	918- 833
----	--------	----	-----	----------

End of Magadha Empire 327 B. C.

Pataliputra Empire

9.	Mahāgupta	7	245	833- 327
----	-----------	---	-----	----------

End of Mahā Gupta Empire 82 B. C.

Ujjayini Empire (Agni Vamsi)

S. No.	Name of the Dynasty.	No. of kings reigned	No. of years reigned	Kali	B. C.
10.	Pānwār Dynasty (one of the Agnivamśi from Emperor Vikramāditya)	24	1275	3020-4295	82 B. C. to 1193 A. D.

The four Agnivamśi or Brahmakṣhātra Vamsas

- I. Pramara or Pānwār Dynasty
- II. Chayahāni or Chouhān Dynasty
 1. Tōmara Dynasty | Sub-divisions of Chouhān
 2. Samaladēva Dynasty
- III. Sukla or Chālukya Dynasty
- IV. Parihāra or Pratihāra Dynasty

List of Kings of the Panwar Dynasty

From Kali 2710 to Kali 4295

No.	Names of the Kings	Years reigned	Era of Kali	Christian Era B. C.
1.	Pramara -	6	2710-2716	392-386
2.	Mahāmara	3	2716-2719	386-383
3.	Dēvāpi	3	2719-2722	383-380
4.	Dēvadūta	3	2522-2725	380-377
5.	Defeated by Sakās left Ujjain and had gone to Sriśailam. These were inefficient and nameless kings. Their names are not mentioned in the Purāṇa.	195	2725-2920	377-182

6.	Gandharva Sēna	50	2920-2970	182-132
7.	Sankharāja son of No 6 (No. 6 went to forest for meditation.)	30	2970-4000	132-102
8.	No. 7 died issueless, Gandharvasēna returned from the forest and took up the Government again.	20	3000-3020	102-82
	VIKRAMADITYA, 2nd son of Gandharvasēna born in 3001 Kali			
9.	(i. e. B. C. 101)	100	3020-3120	82-19A.D.
10.	Dēvabhakta.	10	3120-3130	19-29 "
	Nameless King			
	(Name not given in purāna)			
11.	SALIVAHANA	49	3130-3170	29-78
12.	Sālihōtra	60	3170-3239	78-138
13.	Sālivardhana			
14.	Suhōtra			
15.	Havirhōtra			
16.	Indrapāla	500	3239-3735	138-638
17.	Māyavān			
18.	Sambhudatta			
19.	Bhāumarāja			
20.	Vathsarāja			
21.	BHOJARAJA	56	3739-3795	638-693-94
22.	Sambhudatta			
23.	Bindupāla			
24.	Rājapāla			
25.	Mahinara			
26.	Sōmavarma	300	3795-4095	693-993-94
27.	Kānavarma			
28.	Bhūmipala or (Virasimha)			

No.	Name of the Kings	Years reigned	Era of Kali	Christian Era B. C.
29.	Rangapāla	200	4095-4295	993-1193-94
30.	Kalpasimha			
31.	GANGASIMHA (Issueless)			

This royal dynasty came to a close in the battle of Kurukṣhētra fought with Gory Muhammad. Along with this Dynasty have closed the four dynasties of Agni Vamsi except a few royal families of the Chalukya dynasty that established their might in the South.

II. Chouhan Dynasty. Ajmir. Rajaputana

From 2710 Kali to 4295 Kali or From 392 B. C. to 1193 A. D.

1.	Vayahāni or Chayahāni	12.	Pratāpa or (Chandragupta II)
2.	Tomara. He conquered Indraprastha Rāshtra and reigned there. Tōmara's brother 'Samaladēva' reigned in Ajmir. (Rājaputāna)	13.	Mōhana
3.	Samaladēva	14.	Swētarāya
4.	Mahādeva	15.	Mēghavāha
5.	Ajaya	16.	Lōhādihara
6.	Veerasingha	17.	Veerasingha
7.	Bindusāra	18.	Vibudha
8.	Vikrama or (Veeravīhāntaka)	19.	Chandrārāja
9.	Mānikya	20.	Harihara
10.	Mahasingha	21.	Vasanta
11.	Chandragupta	22.	Balānga
		23.	Pramadha
		24.	Angarāya
		25.	Viśāla

26. Sārangadēva

27. Mantradēva.

28. Jayasimha. (conquered the whole of Aryāvarta.

i. e. Northern Hindustan)

29. Anandadēva.

30. Sōmeswarā. (He had three sons) 1. Dundhu

Kāra. 2. Krishnakumāraka. 3. Prithivīrāja.

1st son Dundhukāra conquered 'Madhura

Rāshtra and reigned there.

3rd son Prithvi Rāja was adopted by Anangā-

pāla of Delhi Rāshtra and reigned there.

(Thōmara Dynasty.)

31. Krishnakumāraka (reigned in Ajmir) (2nd

son of No. 30 King) This Dynasty came to an

end in the battle of Kurukshetra which was

fought with Gōri Mohammad in 1193 A. D.

III. Sukla or Chalukya Dynasty.

Dwāraka Rāshtra (From Kali 2710 to Kali 1295.)

1. Sukla or Chālukya

2. Viśhwakṣēna

3. Jayasēna

4. Viśēna

5. Madasimha

6. Sindhuvarma

7. Sindudweepa

8. Śripati

9. Bhujavarma

10. Kapavarma

11. Chitravarma

12. Dharmavarma

13. Krishnavarma

14. Udaya

15. Vāpyakarma

16. Guhila

17. Kālabhoja

18. Rāshtrapāla

19. Jayapāla

20. Vēnuka

21. Yasovigraha

22. Mahichandra

23. Chandradēva

24. Mandapāla

25. Kumbhapāla or Vyśvapāla

26. Dēvapāla. (He is the son-in-law of Anan-

gapāla of Delhi Rāshtra. (Tomara Dynasty.)

He had two sons. 1. Jayachandra and

2. Ratnakbānala. (Rāni Samyukta was the

daughter of this Jayachandra.)

27. Jayachandra. (He had no sons) This dynasty

came to a close after the Kurukshētra war

which was fought with Gōri Mohammad.

IV. Pratihara¹ or Parihara Dynasty. (Kalinjarapura, Bengal) From Kali 2710-4295.

1. Parihāra
2. Gaura Varma
3. Ghora Varma
4. Supārṇa
5. Rūpana
6. Kāravarma
7. Bhogavarma
8. Kalivarma
9. Kauśika
10. Kāthyāyana
11. Hēnavata
12. Sivavarma
13. Bhāvavarma
14. Rudravarma
15. Bhojavarma
16. Gavavarma
17. Vindhyavarma
18. Sukhaśēna
19. Balāka
20. Lakshmana

21. Mādhava
22. Kēsava
23. Suraśēna
24. Nārāyana
25. Sāntivārma
26. Nadvārma.

(He conquered Gauda Rāsh-
tra and reigned there.)

27. Sarangadēva
28. Gangadēva
29. Anangabūpati
30. Mahīpati I
31. Rājēswara
32. Nrusimha¹
33. Kalivarma II
34. Dhruтивarma
35. Mahīpati II

This Dynansty came to an end after the battle
of Kurushētra which was fought with Gori
Mohammud in 1193 A. D.

A P P E N D I X III

We have sufficiently proved in our works the following
Important dates in the History of Bharat.

		Kali	B.C.
1. Mahābhārata War — B. K. (or before Kali)	B. K.	36	3138
2. Coronation of Yudhistira and Yudhi- ṣṭira era begins	,,	36	,,
3. Birth of Parikṣhit	,,	36	,,
4. Coronation of Somādhi in Magadha (Bārhadratha Dynasty)	,,	36	,,
5. Coronation of Brihadbala in Ayodhya (Ikshwāku Dynasty)	,,	36	,,
6. Coronation of 'Gali' in Nēpāl (Kirāta Dynasty who are Kṣhatriyas by caste)	,,	36	,,
7. Coronation of Gonanda II in Kāshmir (Gonanda Dynasty, Kṣhatriya.)	,,	37½	,,
8. Kṛṣṇa Niryaṇa		—	3102
9. Kali Era begins		—	3102
10. Coronation of Parikṣhit	Kali	1	3101
11. Jayābhyudaya Yudhiṣṭira era begins		1	
12. Yudhiṣṭirakāla era or the Saptarṣhi era or Loukikābda which is still used in Kāshmir		26	3076
13. Death of Parikṣhit		60	3042
14. Janamējaya's gift-deed (Ind. Ant. 333,334)		89	3013
15. Aryabhat (The Great Astronomer)		360	2742
16. Beginning of the 'Yudhistira era of the Jains'		468	2634
17. Coronation of Pradyōta		970	2132
18. Coronation of Siśunāga		1108	1994

19.	Buddha's birth (Buddha was the son of Suddhodana the 23rd king of the Ikshvāku Dynasty which ruled in Ayodhya from 3138 B. C. to 1638 B. C. i. e. 1500 years. 30 kings ruled in this Dynasty. Each king reigned on an average for 50 years. Suddhodana (the father of Buddha) being the 23rd king ($23 \times 50 = 1150$) might have been reigned in the 12th century after the Mahābhārata War. i. e. the 19th century B.C. & not the sixth century B.C.	1215	1887
20.	Contemporaries of Buddha (1) Kṣhēmajit the fourth king of the Siśunāga Dynasty or the 31st, of the Magadha King count- ing from the war, reigned from		
	B. C. 1892-1852	1215	1887
(2)	Bimbiśāra „ 1852-1814	1250	1852
(3)	Ajātaśathru „ 1814-1787	1288	1814
	Buddha's renunciation	1244	1858
	Buddha Niyvaṇa	1295	1807
31.	Mahāpadmananda's Coronation	1468	1634
22.	Chandragupta Maurya „	1568	1534
23.	Coronation of Asoka	1630	1472
24.	Age of Nagarjuna Yogi	1808	1294
25.	Pushpamitra Sunga (Coronation)	1884	1218
26.	Age of Patanjali	1834	1218
27.	Vasudēva Kanwa	2184	913
28.	Āndhra Dynasty (Srimukha)	2269	833
29.	Mālavagana Saka or Era	2377	725
30.	Birth of Vardhamāna Mahā-Vira or 'JINA' (the 24th and last of the Jain prophets	2503	599
„	Niryāna of Jina (or Vardhamāna Mahā- vira) 470 years before Vikrama Era. According Jina-Vijaya ($470 + 58$) 528 B.C.)	2574	528
31.	Birth of Kumārila Bhatta Propagator of Karma-Kanda of the Vēdās. (Contempo- rary to Mahāvira from 557 - 528 B. C. (Cycle year 'Krodhi')	2545	557
„	Kumarila Bhatta was pushed out into the street from the terrace of his Jaina Guru (Cycle year 'DHATA')	2577	525

„	Death of Kumārila Bhatta. (Cycle year 'KILAKA')	2609	493
32.	Cyrus Era. This era was used in Northern India by Vruddha Garga and Varahamihira in their Astronomical treatises.	2552	550
33.	Birth of Sri Sankara (Cycle year 'NANDANA')	2593	509
„	Upanayana of Sankara	2598	504
„	In the beginning of his 8th year he lost his father Sivaguru	2601	501
„	Completed the study of the four Vēdās and Vēdangās	2601	501
„	Got permission of his mother to enter the Holy order of Saṇyāsa (Kārthika Sukla Ekādasi, Cycle year 'PLAVA')	2602	500
„	Initiated by Govinda pādāchārya into karma Sanyasa at Amarakanta on the bank of the Narmada river. (Phālguna Sudha Dwithiya of the Cycle year 'Subha-krut')	2603	499
„	Philosophical study from Govindapādācharya	2603 to 2605	499 497
„	Visited his Paramaguru Goudapādācharya who was aged 120 years by that time at Badarikasrama on the Himalayas and stayed there for four years to study the philosophy at his paramaguru	2605 to 2609	497 493
„	By the order of his Paramaguru Gaudapādāchārya Sri Sankara wrote a Bhāṣhya on Gaudapāda Kārikās and sixteen Bhāshyas on Prasthāna thraya etc., in this period of four years	„	„
„	Initiation of Viṣṇu Sarma 'By Sankara who was his Sahapātti (Co - Student) at Kālāti and who followed him in all his activities. His sanyāsa name is 'CHITSUKHACHARYA' (He was the author of 'Brihat Sankara Vijaya') the first work written on Sankara's life.	„	„
„	Death of Sankara's mother 'Aryamba' Cycle year 'Plavanga'	2608	493

★ Nirvana of Govindapādāchārya (the Guru)
of Sankara (Kārthika Purnima Cycle year 2608 493
'Plavanga')

★ The Glory of Ujjain

"Ujjain had hitherto been ruled by the independent chiefs for a long time, we can surely say that it was standing as a great centre of learning at least from 2450 Kali (652 B. C.) The literary greatness of this town can be realised from the history of Sri Harsha (Vikramarka) who breathed his last in 2645 Kali, (457 B. C.) and of the previous history. Before Sri Harsha (Vikrama), Ujjain was ruled by his maternal Grandfather, whom Sri Harsha succeeded. The mother of Sri Harsha was the daughter of the king of Ujjain. Father was the well-known scholar, Chandra Sarma. Chandra Sarma was the custodian and a propagator of all Oriental lore living in our time. He studied the Mahābhāshyam of Patanjali, from Gaudāpada and propagated throughout the length and breadth of India, during his Garhastya. He took up Sanyāsam in his latter-age received his Brahma - Vidya from the same Gaudapāda in his Turiyāshrama, and propagated it to Sri Vidyāśankara (i.e. Adi Sankaracharya) who founded our Paramahansa Samrajyam.

"Thus Chandra Sarma of Ujjain prestige, was Govindabhagavatpada, the Holy Guru of the well-known Sri Vidyāśankara (Ādi Sankaracharya). Had it not been for the laborious work of Chandra Sarma (Govinda Bhagavatpada, Sanyasa name) in those days, there would not have been any chance for the up-keep of the Indian Literary Lore even to the present day.

"Ujjain is known to have been a great centre of Astronomy, from a long time. Maya, the Father of Indian Astronomy, who lived at the beginning of the Tretayuga, and who lives even to the very day through his Surya Siddhanta, the highest documentary evidence genuine, that has recorded the exact date of the beginning of the universe, correct to the second, and the only extraordinary authority to find out the chronology of the universe, speaks of Ujjain as one of the observatories directly north on his own meridian. Not this much even; it is the seat of one of the Joytirlingams, Maha-Kala by name. As such, Ujjain can very easily be grasped as one of the prominent places in Bharata Varsha from millions past."

„ Initiation of 'Sanandana' into Sanyasa order (His Sanyasa name is Padma Pādāchārya)	2608	493
„ Sankara's going to Prayāga to propagate the Advaita Philosophy. (Magha Bahula Amavasya.)	2609	493
„ The Brahmin who was suffering from leprosy and cured by Sankara at prayāga is the third disciple. His name is 'Udanka'	2609	493
„ The fourth disciple was the dumb man who was the son of Prabhakarādhvarin by name 'Pridhvidhara'. His Sanyasa name given by Sankara is 'Hastāmalakāchārya'	„	„
„ Prabhakarādhvarin the father of Pridhvidhara also took the order of Sanyasa.	„	„
„ Sankara in his 16th year met Kumarila Bhatta for the first and the last time in Ruddhapura near Prayaga in the act of self-immolation by Kumarila Bhatta. (Kumarila is older than Sankara by 48 years.)		
Cycle year 'Kilaka'	„	„

(Vide pages 146-148 of 'Epochs of Bharata Varsha' by Jagadguru Sri Kalyāṇananda Bharati Mantacharya Swami of Sringeri Sri Virupaksha Sri Peetam).

The chief among the disciples of, and one in regular succession of Vedantic teachers from Gaudapadacharya was Govinda Yogin. This Govinda yogin or Govinda Bhagavat-pada as Sankara uniformly calls him in his works was no other person than Chandra Sarman, the renowned grammarian who is said to have had the special fortune of preserving to the world Patanjali's Mahābhāṣya on Pāṇini's Ashtādhyāyī as amplified by Kātyāyana's vartika, as we possess it at present. The traditions current in different parts of India as well as the written accounts that are recorded in Patanjali Vijaya, Gaudapādāśāsa, and Hariniśriya, inform us that he was a learned Brahmana of Prachyadesa (Andhradesa) that he was well-versed in the Vaidika and Laukika literatures of his day, that he had the special fortune of learning the Mahābhāṣya from Gaudapādāchārya, that he settled at Ujjain and married Seelavati the only daughter of the Brahmin king of Ujjain who was descended from the Brahmin dynasty of Dhunji who established a Brahmin kingdom in Ujjain in the ninth century

The Great Pandit 'Mandana Miśra' was an independent Brahmin Chief or Raja of an important state with Mahishmatipura as the seat. He was a Kānva Brahmin of the south. He was the disciple of Kumārila Bhatta and a staunch adherent to Karma Kānda of the Vēdās. After a great discussion Mandana Miśra became the disciple of Sri Sankara, leaving his Gruhasta Ashrama he became a Sanyasin. His Sanyasa name is 'Surēswarāchārya' (Cycle year 'Sādhārana')

2611 491

Sri Sankāra founded the 'Dwaraka Mutt' (Māgha Sukla Saptami of the cycle year Sādhārana with 'Hastāmalaka' as its 1st Adhipati.

2611 491

before Christ. It is written by some that he also married two other wives (Sumati and Madanarekha) from the Vysya and the Sudra castes, and became the father of four sons who all became renowned in Indian Literature under the names of Bhartri-Hari, Sri Harsha, Bhatti and Vararuchi." (This 'Vararuchi' is different from the Vararuchi of 57 Bc., one of the nine Gems of Vikramaditya's court.)

Bhartrihari or Bhartri-prapancha as he was generally known in his later Ashrama, was the eldest son of Govinda Bhagavat-pada by his Royal Bhrahmin wife Seelavati (Daughter of the king of Ujjain). He is said to have ruled the kingdom of Ujjain for some time, as being the eldest son of his Royal mother by Chadra Sarmā; but being disgusted with the unchastity of his beloved queen, he soon resigned the kingdom in favour of his valarous brother Sri Harsha. He thereupon became a sanyasin and lived with his aged father as one of his constant chēlās. His proper name was 'Hari,' and 'Bhartri' was merely a title like "His Majesty."

Govinda Bhagavatpāda lived partly at Badarikashrama on the Himalayas, where his teacher, great teacher and great-great teacher lived, learning the Vedānta from their lips, and partly at Amarakanta on the bank of the Narmada near Ujjain teaching the Vedānta to his disciples in turn. Govinda Bhagavatpāda was like his Parama guru (Sri Sukayogindra) a born Siddha and a great yogin. Besides the Mañabhashya

„ Sankara visited Nêpāl and destroyed the Buddha faith. (Vide the Indian Antiquary Vol. XIII p 417 ff.)	2614	488 to 487
„ Fouded 'Jyotir Mutt' in the Himalayas Pushya Suddha Purnima of the cycle year Rākshasa) with 'Throtakāchārya' as its 1st Adhipati.	2616	486
„ Sankara founded the 'Govardhana Mutt' of Puri (Jagannath), (Vaiśākha Sukla Navami of the cycle year 'Nala') with 'Padmapādāchārya as its Adhipati	2617	485

which is said to have reproduced in its present shape, only three other works "Yoga-Tārāvali, Advaitānubhūti, and Brahmāmrita-varshini are ascribed to him.

Sankara, after wandering for nearly a year in search of his appointed Guru, arrived with his co-student and disciple Vishnu Sarana on the bank of the Narmada, and met Sri Govinda Yogin, by a happy coincidence, in his own hermitage, surrounded by his illustrious son 'Bhartri-Hari' (who was also a Sanyasin) and his disciples. Sankara gladly chose Govinda Yogin as his Holy Teacher, and the latter was most happy to accept the former as his worthy pupil. Though the teacher felt himself inferior to the pupil, yet Govinda Bhagavatpāda obeyed the Lord's command by making Sankara go through the formalities needed for becoming a full ascetic (Karma-Sanyasin).

"In his Brihat-Sankara Vijaya Chitsukha-Charya informs us that Sankara took the permission of his mother to become a Sanyasin on the 11th day of the Bright-half of the month of Kartika of the year 2639 of the Yudhishtira Saka (corresponding to 500 B. C.), and was ordained as a regular Sannyasin by Govinda Bhagavatpada on the 2nd day of the Bright-half of the month of Phalguna of the year 2640 of the Yudhishtira Saka (corresponding to 499 B. C.). So Sankara became a full Sannyasin in his tenth year, and under the guidance of Govinda Bhagavatapada and his worthy son Bhartrihari, he became master of all the Sashttras before he completed his twelfth year. It is said that Sankara had very great reverence for Bhatrihari or Bhartriprapancha as he calls him and it was in emulation of him and at his inducement that Sankara wrote many of his minor works and commentaries,

" The Sārada Mutt at 'Sringeri' was founded in Pushya Pūrṇima of the year 'Pingala' with 'Sureswarāchārya' as its first Peeta-dhipathi.	2618	484
" The 'Kamakoti peetha' at 'Kanchi' was founded in vaiśākha Sukla Pūrṇima of the year 'Siddhārdhin' with Adi-Sankara himself as its first Acharya	2620	482
" Nirvana of Sri Sankara in his 32nd year (Cycle year 'Raktākshi')	2625	477

" While Sankara was in Kalati attending his mother's funeral ceremony, a young Brahmin by name Sanandana arrives at kalati and informs Sankara that his revered guru Sri Govinda Bhagavatpada whom he had left at Badarikasrama has returned to his hermitage at Amarakanta (or Amareshwar) on the bank of Narmada owing to serious illness and that he is very anxious to see him before he quits his body in the world. After enquiring of the young man and of his object in going to him, Sankara accepts Sanandana as his disciple and starts at once to Amareshwara with his two disciples Chitsukha and Sanandana and manages to arrive in the course of a month at his Guru's hermitage,

" There, in the island of Māndhātā formed on the Vaidūryamani Parvata in the Middle of Narmada, Sankara finds his aged and revered Guru, Govinda Bhagavatpada, lying on his death-bed surrounded by his devoted son Bhartrihari and his other loving disciples anxiously watching the last moments of his mundane existence as a Yogin, and is deeply moved at the pitiable sight of his teacher who had already lost his consciousness. It was in the cycle year 'Plavanga', the Pūrṇima (Full-Moon) day of the month of Kartika of the year 2646 of the yudhisthira Saka (of 3138 B. C.), and on hearing the sweet voice of Sankara crying by his side, Govinda Bhagavatpada suddenly recovers his senses, rises up like a strong healthy man from his bed, embraces Sankara with his arms, exhorts him to undertake his victorious tour (Digvijaya) throughout India to establish his Advaita Philosophy in the world, orders his pupils to follow Sankara in future as their master, imparts to them his last lesson on the duties of a Sanyasī called Turiyasrama Dharmopadesa, blesses Sankara 'once more and ensures him success in his grand undertaking and quietly passes away from the world, Yogin as he was, uttering the sacred syllable "Om" (Pranava) as his last word on this earth (493 B. C.)

34.	Sri Harsha Era (King of Ujjain)	2645	457
35.	Division of Andhra Empire	2775	327
36.	Gupta Dynasty begins (Chandragupta) (Contemporary of Alexander)	2775	327
37.	Gupta Era	2775	327
38.	Alexander's Invasion	2776	326
39.	Coronation of Samudragupta	2782	320
40.	End of Mahā Gupta Empire	3020	82
41.	Birth of Vikramaditya	3001	101
42.	Coronation of Vikramāditya at Ujjain (Mālwa Rāṣṭra)	3020	82
43.	Vikrama Era	3044	57
44.	Kālidasa, Varāhamihira etc. nine Gems in the court of Vikramāditya.	3044	57
45.	Christian Era begins	3102	A. D.

"As soon as the ceremonies connected with the Siddhi of Govinda bhagavatpada are over, and his body is interred in a Samadhi constructed by the disciples for the time being, Sankara admits Sadananda into the sacred order of Sanyasins.

"It is stated by Chitsukhacharya, in his Brihat Sankara Vijaya, that when the wonderful news of the Siddhi (death) of Govinda Bhagavatpada reached the ears of *Sriharsha Vikramaditya, the then Emperor of Ujjain* he proceeded to the Island of Mandhata in Amarevara on the bank of the Narmada where the sacred body of his revered father was interred by his disciples and in memory of his sacred name whose last word was Onkara, caused the great temple of Onkaranatha erected over his Samadhi. Compare also the following verse of Patanjali Charitra (VIII-72)

“ ఇథం ప్రశాస్య ప్రపయాః స్వకేమ్యాన్ శంకరానుగాన్ ।
నియోజ్య శంకరాచార్యమద్యైతస్థాపనేగురుః ॥
సోఽహమస్మేతి నిశ్చిత్వ విసృజ్యేతిర కాశ్చితాన్ ।
ఓమిత్యేకాక్షరంబ్రహ్మ ధ్యాయన్నంతః పరంకేవమ్ ॥
కాస్త్రశ్రుత్యంగశేత్రాబ్జే (2646) యధిష్ఠిరశశ్శ్వవై (3138 B. C) ।
ప్రపంగే కార్తికేమాసి పూర్ణిమాయాం గుహోర్ధ్వే ॥
శ్రీమద్దోడపదాచార్యశిష్యో యోగవిదాంవరః ।
గోవిందభగవత్పదః సిద్ధిం సంప్రాప సంయమి ॥”

“ గోవిందస్య ప్రతికలగుహోః సిద్ధిమాకర్ణకృత్వా ।
యత్కర్తవ్యం తదపి పరబ్రహ్మదయో భ్రాతరస్యే ॥
స్వే స్వే కర్మణ్యవహితధియో విద్యయా క్షీర్తిమంతి ।
శ్చత్వరోఽపి సిద్ధిమభిమతా మజ్జయన్త్యా మకుర్చ్ఛన్ ॥”

46.	Coronation of Śalivāhana (Great grandson of Vikramāditya of 57 B. C.)	Kali 3179	A. D. 78
47.	Bhattotpala (Astronomer)	3439	338
48.	Bhāskaraāchārya, the Great Astronomer and Mathematician	3587	486
49.	Coronation of Bhojarāja	3739	638
50.	Birth of Rāmānujāchārya	4118	1017
51.	„ Madhvāchārya	4220	1119
52.	Battle of Kuruśhetra with Mahammud Gori	4295	1193
53.	Independent Bhārat	5048	1947

“ इत्थं प्रज्ञास्य प्रवयाः स्वशिष्यान् शंकरानुगान् ।

नियोज्य शंकराचार्यं मद्देवैतस्थापनेगुरुः ॥

सोऽहमस्मीति निश्चित्य विस्तृज्येतरकांक्षितान् ।

ओमित्येकाक्षरं ब्रह्म द्यायन्त परं शिवम् ॥

शास्त्रसृष्ट्यंगनेत्राद्वे (2643) युविष्ठिरशवस्यवै (3138 B. C.)

पूवंगे कार्तिकेमासि पूर्णिमायां गुरोर्दिने ॥

श्रीमद्गौडपदाचार्यं शिष्यो योगविदां वरः ।

गोविन्दभगवत्पादः सिद्धिं संप्राप संयमी ॥”

“गोविन्दस्य व्रतिकुलगुरोः सिद्धिदमाकर्ण्यकृत्वा ।

यत्कृतं व्यं तदपि वररुच्यादयो भ्रातरस्ते ।

स्वे स्वे कर्मण्यवहितधियो विद्यया कीर्तिमन्त ।

श्चत्वारोऽपि स्थितिभूमिता मुज्जयिन्या मकुर्वन् ॥”

We are told by reliable Persons that the great shrine of Onkaranatha constructed by Sri-Harsha Vikramaditya in memory of his sacred father, is even to this day considered by the Hindus as one of their most sacred places of pilgrimage and that a grand festival is celebrated every year in this shrine on the Purnima day of the month of Kartika in memory of the great day on which Govinda Bhagavatpada attained his Brahmibhava. It is said that this festival attracts over 15,000 devotees from all parts of the country who consider the sanctity of Narmada on this day of the year above that of any other river, and say that while it requires 3 day's bathing in the Sarasvati, 7 Day's in the Yamuna, and 1 day's in Ganga, the mere sight of the Narmada at this place suffices to make men pure. (Vide Age of Sankara Part I A, P, P. 99-103.)

APPENDIX IV

Some major errors in modern books on Indian History

Age of Kāniṣhka 1294 to 1234 B. C.

He was the 51st among the Kāshmir kings. He lived in the 13th century B. C., but not in the 1st century A. D., as was stated by the western historians. He never ruled in Ujjain. No era was started in his time. (Vide Rājatarangini)

Mihirakula

He was not a Hūṇa as the modern historians say. They misrepresented his whole history. He was a Kshatriya. He belonged to the Gonanda dynasty; he was the 64th king in the list of Kāshmir kings. His age was 704 B. C. to 634 B. C.) (Vide Rājatarangini)

Toramana

Toramāna was not a foreign king. He was not a Hūṇa by race. He was a kshatriya. He was the younger brother of Hiranya the 82nd king of Kāshmir. (16 B. C. to 14 A. D.) Being Yuvarāja 'Toramāna' issued coins in his name removing the coins bearing the image of the Goddess 'Bāla'. This enraged the king (his brother). So he was imprisoned and died in prison. Toramanā's son was Pravarasēna. (Vide Rājatarangini) He ruled Kashmir as the 84th king after Matrigupta the 83rd ruler who was nominated by 'Vikramaditya' Emperor of Bharat.

The statement of the western historians that Thōramāna is the father of Mihira-kula and they both belong to Hūṇa race is false and fictitious. They both belong to the Dynasty of Gonanda III the 53 king in the list of Kashmir rulers. (1182 B.C.) Mihirakula is the 12th King from Gonanda III (704 B. C.) and Thoramāna is the brother of the 30th king 'Hiranya' from Gonanda III (16 B. C.) He never ruled any where.

Age of Nagarjuna Yogi

The Great Buddhist Yogi Nāgārjuna is a Kshatriya king. He visited Kāshmir twice, in the reigns of Kanishka and his successor Abhimānyu in the 13th century B. C. His age is between 1294 B. C. and 1234 B. C. (Vide Rājatarangini)

Patanjali

On the request of the king of Kāshmir named Abhimānyu (1234-1182 B. C.) the famous Pandit Chandrāchārya went to Kāshmir, opened a Pāṭhaśāla and taught Patanjali's Mahabhāṣya to his pupils. He also wrote a Sanskrit Grammar. Therefore Patanjali might have lived before 12th century B. C. (Vide Rājatarangini).

Asoka

There were two Aśkas, one belonging to the Maurya dynasty and another belonging to the Gonanda dynasty of

Kāshmir, Both of them were contemporaries. Kāshmir Aśoka is the 48th monarch in the list of Kāshmir kings. He lost his Kingdom to the Mlechchās and fled to the forest where he died. His son 'Jalauka' reconquered Kāshmir from the Mlēcchās. Kāshmir Aśoka's grandson was 'Damodara' II the 50th king in the list of Kāshmir rulers. The 51st. King is Kanishka 52nd king Abhimanyu, the father of Gonanda III of 1182 B. C. The 53rd king in the Kāshmir list of kings is said to have been 2330 years before Kalhana i.e. in 1182 B. C. Aśoka was the 6th king counted back from this 53rd king. His time was 1448-1400 B.C. That the Kāshmir Aśoka and Maurya Aśoka (1472-36 B.C.) were contemporaries is admitted by the western historians. So it follows that Maurya Aśoka flourished in the 15th century B. C. and not in the 3rd century B.C. as is now generally understood. According to the Purāṇas the Maurya Aśoka's time is 1472-36 B. C. (Vide Rajatarangini)

Speaking of the Indian sources, Dr. Fleet wrote :

"We should not be able to deduce the date of Aśoka from the Purāṇas. But we should find *that the Rajatarangini would place him somewhere about 1260. B. C.* We shall find, indeed, that the Nēpāl Vamśāvali would place him; roughly, about B. C. 2600. As, however, that list does not mention him as a ruler of Nēpāl but only as a visitor to the country, we should probably infer a mistake in that account, *and prefer to select the date 1260. B. C.* And then we should set about arranging the succession of the kings of India itself, from the Purāṇas, with 1260 B. C. for the approximate date of the succession of Aśoka as our starting point." (Quoted by M. Krishnamacharya in his History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, Intro. P. XCII)

As I have drawn from Rājatarangini in pointing out the errors of modern historians, I invite the reader's attention to the esteem in which this historical work of Kāshmir is held by wellknown scholars.

Mr. V. A. Smith has the following to say on Kalhaṇa's work :—

"This Sanskrit book which comes nearest to the European notion of a regular History is the Rājatarangini of Kalhana, a metrical chronicle of Kāshmir, written in the twelfth century by the son of a minister of the Raja'.

(Page 54 of the Oxford Students' History of India. By (V. A. Smith Ed. 1915)

Such a book as Rajatarangini is unique in the literature of the world." (P 8. A Short History of Kashmir, by P. Gwalal, B. A.)

'Kalhana's Rajatarangini is almost a revelation. Among the master-pieces of the world, his history is also one' (Ibid.)

ERRATA

Page	Line	Read	for
n Foreword			
5	50	Credence	Evidence
Introduction			
60	2	Won	One
61	52	Indubitable	Indubitable
62	53	Unswerving	Answering
13	25	dwathrimsan-	Dwathrisan
		murthi	murthi
14	33 (last line)	सैरप्यहं	सैरप्यहं
23	27	riddles	riddles
28	23	to	io
49	33	askance	asknance
53	25	Sunsa	Snusa
67	37	of	o
70	7	VI	IV
72	17	intervals	itntervals
77	2	Before Kali	Kali
78	19	1389	1339
79	1	V. Suryavamsi	VI. Thakuri
		Dynasty	Dynasty
82	24	991	999
91	9	Child	Chaild

